

THE  
OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI  
VOLUME LXVII



THE  
OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI  
VOLUME LXVII

EDITED WITH TRANSLATIONS AND NOTES BY

R. A. COLES

and

N. GONIS      A. NODAR      D. OBBINK      R. STEWART

WITH CONTRIBUTIONS BY

R. ASHDOWNE	J. HORDERN	M. D. REEVE
G. AZZARELLO	D. HUGHES	M. RICHTER
A. K. BOWMAN	C. JUNG	I. RUFFELL
G. M. BROWNE	D. KOVACS	T. SCHELZIUS
K. BÜHLER	N. LITINAS	G. SCHENKE
J. L. CALVO MARTÍNEZ	K. LUCHNER	G. SCHMELZ
D. COLOMO	J. McMILLAN	T. S. SCHMIDT
B. CURRIE	E. MADISON	C. SELZER
R. DILCHER	R. MAZZA	J. C. SHELTON
A. GIACOMONI	D. MONTSERRAT	A. SPEYER
V. GIANNOPOULOU	C. MÜLKE	J. SPOONER
B. GRAZIOSI	T. NELSON	R. D. SULLIVAN
H.-C. GÜNTHER	M. OGAWA	J. D. THOMAS
R. HATZILAMBROU	P. PORMANN	T. TSIROPOULOU
S. HOBAN	M. POWERS	M. WILLIS

Graeco-Roman Memoirs, No. 87

PUBLISHED FOR  
THE BRITISH ACADEMY  
BY THE  
EGYPT EXPLORATION SOCIETY  
3 DOUGHTY MEWS, LONDON WC1N 2PG  
2001

TYPESET BY THE STINGRAY OFFICE, MANCHESTER  
PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN  
BY THE CHARLESWORTH GROUP, HUDDERSFIELD  
AND PUBLISHED FOR  
THE BRITISH ACADEMY  
BY THE EGYPT EXPLORATION SOCIETY  
(REGISTERED CHARITY NO. 212384)  
3 DOUGHTY MEWS, LONDON WC1N 2PG

Gracco-Roman Memoirs

ISSN 0306-9222

ISBN 0 85698 141 9

© EGYPT EXPLORATION SOCIETY 2001

## PREFACE

This volume, the first to be published under the auspices of the Arts and Humanities Research Board, gathers the work of no fewer than fifty contributors. In Part I, Dr Obbink has co-ordinated the editing of twenty-four papyri of extant plays of Euripides. Editions of many of these pieces had been prepared by past and present Oxford students, as with the texts in Part II; five formed part of the University College London doctoral thesis of the late Dr David Hughes, and had been made accessible to Professor James Diggle for his OCT edition. Revision of some of Dr Hughes's texts is due to Dr Alberto Nodar.

Part II, also co-ordinated by Dr Obbink, contains parts of twelve different MSS of Oration XIX of Demosthenes, two of them (**4569** and **4577**) extensive; a pre-publication typescript was made available to Professor D. M. MacDowell for his OUP edition.

In Part III, 'Oracular Texts', Dr Randall Stewart has edited **4581**, comprising several pages of a codex of Astrampsychus, notable especially for containing a substantial section extra to the text known from the medieval MSS.

Part IV presents forty-two documents of the Roman and Byzantine periods, several of them relating to particular themes. Two declarations for epicrisis formed part of the Ph.D. thesis of Dr D. Montserrat, as did a document concerning credit in grain; further texts of this latter type come from the Ph.D. thesis of Dr N. Litinas. Coles has prepared sixteen items all from the years AD 361–4 which relate to the transport of *annonae* commodities, in the first year of this period unusually to Pelusium. Dr Gonis has edited a number of Byzantine documents, several of them in a group concerned with the churches of Oxyrhynchus.

Part V adds six private letters in which there is both historical and palaeographical interest. Two of these, and two of the documents in Part IV, were studied at the 1997 Oxford Summer School in Papyrology.

Part VI provides publication numbers in the series for nine papyri with Homeric *scholia minora*, which formed part of the Ph.D. thesis of Dr J. Spooner and are to be published in *Studi e Testi di Papirologia* NS vol. i (Firenze).

Dr Gonis has prepared the index for Part III; Coles has indexed Parts IV–V. This is the first volume of *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* to have colour plates, which have been prepared from digital images created by Dr Gideon Nisbet. Images of all the items in the volume may be viewed at <http://www.csad.ox.ac.uk/POxy/>

We are deeply grateful to Dr Jeffrey Dean for his meticulous typesetting and to The Charlesworth Group for the rapid production of the volume.

We take this opportunity to announce that the full publication of the astronomical texts included by title only in Vol. LXI of *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (nos. **4133–4300**) is now obtainable from the American Philosophical Society: Alexander Jones, *Astronomical Papyri from Oxyrhynchus*, Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society, 233 (Philadelphia 1999); ISBN 0-87169-233-9.

March, 2001

R. A. COLES  
P. J. PARSONS  
J. R. REA  
J. D. THOMAS  
*General Editors*



# CONTENTS

PREFACE	v
TABLE OF PAPYRI	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xii
LIST OF PLATES	xiii
NUMBERS AND PLATES	xiii
NOTE ON THE METHOD OF PUBLICATION AND ABBREVIATIONS	xiv

## TEXTS

I. EURIPIDES (4545–4568)	i
II. DEMOSTHENES (4569–4580)	63
III. ORACULAR TEXTS (4581)	114
IV. DOCUMENTARY TEXTS (4582–4623)	140
V. PRIVATE LETTERS (4624–4629)	257
VI. <i>SCHOLIA MINORA</i> TO HOMER, <i>ILIAD</i> II (4630–4638)	270

## INDEXES

I. ORACULAR TEXTS	271
II. RULERS AND REGNAL YEARS	274
III. CONSULS	275
IV. INDICTIONS AND ERAS	275
V. MONTHS AND DAYS	275
VI. DATES	276
VII. PERSONAL NAMES	276
VIII. GEOGRAPHICAL	
(a) COUNTRIES, NOMES, TOPARCHIES, CITIES ETC.	281
(b) VILLAGES, ETC.	281
(c) MISCELLANEOUS	281
IX. RELIGION	282
X. OFFICIAL AND MILITARY TERMS AND TITLES	283
XI. PROFESSIONS, TRADES AND OCCUPATIONS	284
XII. MEASURES	
(a) WEIGHTS AND MEASURES	284
(b) MONEY	284
XIII. TAXES	285
XIV. GENERAL INDEX OF WORDS	285
XV. CORRECTIONS TO PUBLISHED TEXTS	294





# TABLE OF PAPYRI

## I. EURIPIDES

<b>4545–4568</b>	General introduction	DO		1
<b>4545</b>	<i>Cyclops</i> 455–71, 479–81, 484–96	HCG	Fourth century	16
<b>4546</b>	<i>Alcestis</i> 344–82 with omissions	DO	First century BC/ first century AD	19
<b>4547</b>	<i>Alcestis</i> 771–9	DH	Late second/ third century	22
<b>4548</b>	<i>Medea</i> 131, 139–48	DH/AN	Fourth century	23
<b>4549</b>	<i>Medea</i> 718–35 (desunt 725–6, 727 post 729), 736–7(?)	DH/AN	Third century	24
<b>4550</b>	<i>Medea</i> 748(?)–52, 1007–9, 1345–6(?)	DH/AN	Second century	26
<b>4551</b>	<i>Andromacha</i> 46–62	MO	Fourth century	28
<b>4552</b>	<i>Andromacha</i> 87–91	CM	Second century	29
<b>4553</b>	<i>Andromacha</i> 93–9, 150–1(?)	DO	Fourth century?	30
<b>4554</b>	<i>Andromacha</i> 748–51, 790–2	DO	Fifth century?	31
<b>4555</b>	<i>Andromacha</i> 809–50, 851–91, 1061–96, 1100–37	AN	Sixth century	32
<b>4556</b>	<i>Hecuba</i> 604–7	DO	Third century	38
<b>4557</b>	<i>Hecuba</i> 651–9, 710–38, 742–73 (desunt 756–9)	DH/AN	Second century	39
<b>4558</b>	<i>Hecuba</i> 709–22, 746–61 (desunt 756–9), 782–94, 816–27	AN	Late sixth century	44
<b>4559</b>	<i>Hecuba</i> 739–51, 768–87	DO	Fourth century	47
<b>4560</b>	<i>Hecuba</i> 765–84	VG	Late second/ third century	49
<b>4561</b>	<i>Hecuba</i> 1252–70	EM	Third century	51
<b>4562</b>	<i>Hercules</i> 32–40	TN	Late second/ third century	54
<b>4563</b>	<i>Hercules</i> 551–60	RD/DK/MR	Late second/ third century	55
<b>4564</b>	<i>Troades</i> 340–6	VG	Late third/ fourth century	58
<b>4565</b>	<i>IT</i> 1340–52, 1367–78	KB/CS	Second century	59
<b>4566</b>	<i>Phoenissae</i> 1327–37	DK	First century	60
<b>4567</b>	<i>Orestes</i> 599–601 (+ 2 further vv.)	AS	Second/third century	61
<b>4568</b>	<i>Rhesus</i> 839–47	DO	Third century	62

## TABLE OF PAPYRI

## II. DEMOSTHENES

<b>4569–4580</b>	General introduction	DO		63
<b>4569</b>	XIX 1–7, 9–13, 208–22, 309–10, 314–5	BC/BG/JH/ AN/TS	Third/fourth century	66
<b>4570</b>	XIX 13, 17, 155–6	MP	Third century	80
<b>4571</b>	XIX 50–1	RH	Third century	83
<b>4572</b>	XIX 79–80	SH	Second/third century	84
<b>4573</b>	XIX 92–3	KL	Second century	86
<b>4574</b>	XIX 101–2	DO	Second century	88
<b>4575</b>	XIX 148–9, 223–4, 316	RA/IR/TT	Third century	89
<b>4576</b>	XIX 150–1	MW	Third/fourth century	92
<b>4577</b>	XIX 154–8, 173–5, 203–5, 211, 231–2, 234–40, 243–5, 293–4	DC/AG/CJ/ AN/PP	Later third century	93
<b>4578</b>	XIX 237, 240, 306–7	MDR/TSS	Second/third century	108
<b>4579</b>	XIX 241–3, 245–6	DO	Third/fourth century	111
<b>4580</b>	XIX 325	DO	Second/third century	112

## III. ORACULAR TEXTS

<b>4581</b>	<i>Sortes Astrampychi</i>	RS	Fifth/sixth century	114
-------------	---------------------------	----	---------------------	-----

## IV. DOCUMENTARY TEXTS

<b>4582</b>	Petition from beekeepers	RDS/RAC	Sep. AD 16	140
<b>4583</b>	Oath of beekeepers	RAC	15 Sep. 45	142
<b>4584</b>	Declaration for epicrisis	DM	100/101	144
<b>4585</b>	Declaration for epicrisis	DM	Jan./Feb. 189	146
<b>4586</b>	Cession of vacant lot	GMB	Third century	149
<b>4587–4590</b>	General introduction	RAC		152
<b>4587</b>	Notice of credit in grain	DM	179	153
<b>4588</b>	Orders for transfer of credit in grain	GA	26 Sep. 33	154
<b>4589</b>	Notices of transfer of credit in grain	NL	168/9–174/5	155
<b>4590</b>	Notices of transfer of credit in grain	NL	Summer 231	160
<b>4591</b>	Account of issue of seed	NL	18–22 Nov. 231?	164
<b>4592</b>	Letter of a Roman emperor(?)	AKB	Second or third century	167
<b>4593</b>	Petition to the prefect	JDT	Between 206–211	170

IV. DOCUMENTARY TEXTS

xi

<b>4594</b>	Lease of land	JMcM	228	177
<b>4595</b>	Lease of land	JLCM/NG	15 Oct. 261	178
<b>4596</b>	Apprenticeship contract	JDT	27 Nov.–26 Dec. 264(?)	182
<b>4597</b>	Contract for substitution in a liturgy	JCS/RAC	19 Nov. 294	186
<b>4598–4605</b>	General introduction	RAC		189
<b>4598</b>	Declaration of delivery of pork and chaff to Pelusium	RAC	10 July 361	192
<b>4599</b>	Account of pork and chaff	RAC	10 July 361	194
<b>4600</b>	Acknowledgment of receipt of pork	RAC	14 June 361	196
<b>4601</b>	Acknowledgment of receipt of chaff	RAC	22 June 361	197
<b>4602</b>	Letter to the strategus	RAC	Oct./Nov. 361	198
<b>4603</b>	Receipt for delivery to Pelusium	RAC	17 Oct. 361	199
<b>4604</b>	Acknowledgment of receipt of gold	RAC	361	200
<b>4605</b>	Receipt for monads of denarii in Alexandria	RAC	29 June 361	203
<b>4606–4613</b>	General introduction	RAC		204
<b>4606</b>	Undertaking to deliver wheat to Pelusium	RAC	Aug./Sep. 361	205
<b>4607</b>	Receipts of <i>annonae</i> commodities	RAC	362/3	209
<b>4608</b>	Undertaking to deliver barley to Alexandria	RAC	362 (after 1 May)	215
<b>4609</b>	Undertaking to deliver wheat to Alexandria	RAC	362 (after 1 May)	217
<b>4610</b>	Undertaking to deliver barley	RAC	13 June 363	220
<b>4611</b>	Undertaking to deliver wheat	RAC	July/Aug. 363	222
<b>4612</b>	Undertaking to deliver wheat to Alexandria	RAC	July/Aug. 363	225
<b>4613</b>	Undertaking to deliver barley to Alexandria	RAC	Early 364	229
<b>4614</b>	Document (petition?) addressed to Fl. Strategius I	NG	Late fifth century	232
<b>4615</b>	Lease of land	NG	3 Sep. 505	234
<b>4616</b>	Receipt for part of an irrigation machine	NG	30 Sep. 525	238
<b>4617</b>	List of festal payments	GSchm	Fifth/early sixth century	241
<b>4618</b>	List of churches	NG	Sixth century	245
<b>4619</b>	List of churches and chapels	NG	Early sixth century	249
<b>4620</b>	Offerings to religious institutions	JDT	Fifth/sixth century	250
<b>4621</b>	Order to supply wine	NG	Fifth/sixth century	253
<b>4622</b>	Order to supply wine	NG	Fifth/sixth century	254
<b>4623</b>	Order to supply old axes to a church	NG	Late sixth century	255

## V. PRIVATE LETTERS

<b>4624</b>	Dius to Sarapion	JLCM	First century	257
<b>4625</b>	Maximus to Ofellius	JLCM	Third century?	259
<b>4626</b>	Nilus to Thalia	JLCM	After 259	260
<b>4627</b>	Serenus to Hieracapollon	JLCM	Late third century	262
<b>4628</b>	Gerontius to Colluthus	RM	Fourth century	263
<b>4629</b>	Letter to a countess	GSche	Sixth/seventh century	266

VI. *SCHOLIA MINORA* TO HOMER, *ILIAD* II

<b>4630–4638</b>	Descriptive List	JS	First to third centuries	270
------------------	------------------	----	-----------------------------	-----

RA = R. Ashdowne	JH = J. Hordern	MDR = M. D. Reeve
GA = G. Azzarello	DH = D. Hughes	MR = M. Richter
AKB = A. K. Bowman	CJ = C. Jung	IR = I. Russell
GMB = G. M. Browne	DK = D. Kovacs	TS = T. Schelzius
KB = K. Bühler	NL = N. Litinas	GSche = G. Schenke
JLCM = J. L. Calvo Martínez	KL = K. Luchner	G. Schm = G. Schmelz
RAC = R. A. Coles	JMcM = J. McMillan	TSS = T. S. Schmidt
DC = D. Colomo	EM = E. Madison	CS = C. Selzer
BC = B. Currie	RM = R. Mazza	JCS = J. C. Shelton
RD = R. Dilcher	DM = D. Montserrat	AS = A. Speyer
AG = A. Giacomoni	CM = C. Mülke	JS = J. Spooner
VG = V. Giannopoulou	TN = T. Nelson	RS = R. Stewart
NG = N. Gonis	AN = A. Nodar	RDS = R. D. Sullivan
BG = B. Graziosi	DO = D. Obbink	JDT = J. D. Thomas
HCG = H.-C. Günther	MO = M. Ogawa	TT = T. Tsiropoulou
RH = R. Hatzilambrou	PP = P. Pormann	MW = M. Willis
SH = S. Hoban	MP = M. Powers	

## LIST OF TABLES

1.	Papyri of Euripides	2
2.	Papyri of Demosthenes XIX	64
3.	Questions and answers in the new decades of the <i>Sortes Astrampsychi</i>	116
4.	Oxyrynchite councillors undertaking delivery of <i>annona</i>	206

LIST OF PLATES

I. <b>4545, 4564, 4566</b>	V. <b>4589</b>	X. <b>4628</b>
II. <b>4546, 4551, 4573</b>	VI-VII. <b>4611-12</b>	XI. <b>4617</b>
III. <b>4581</b> part	VIII. <b>4593</b>	XII. <b>4618</b>
IV. <b>4583, 4625, 4629</b>	IX. <b>4624</b>	

NUMBERS AND PLATES

<b>4545</b>	I	<b>4581</b> part	III	<b>4618</b>	XII
<b>4546</b>	II	<b>4583</b>	IV	<b>4624</b>	IX
<b>4551</b>	II	<b>4589</b>	V	<b>4625</b>	IV
<b>4564</b>	I	<b>4593</b>	VIII	<b>4628</b>	X
<b>4566</b>	I	<b>4611-12</b>	VI-VII	<b>4629</b>	IV
<b>4573</b>	II	<b>4617</b>	XI		

## NOTE ON THE METHOD OF PUBLICATION AND ABBREVIATIONS

The basis of the method is the Leiden system of punctuation, see *CE* 7 (1932) 262–9. It may be summarized as follows:

$a\beta\gamma$	The letters are doubtful, either because of damage or because they are otherwise difficult to read
. . .	Approximately three letters remain unread by the editor
[ $a\beta\gamma$ ]	The letters are lost, but restored from a parallel or by conjecture
[. . .]	Approximately three letters are lost
( )	Round brackets indicate the resolution of an abbreviation or a symbol, e.g. ( $\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\acute{\alpha}\beta\eta$ ) represents the symbol $\overline{\alpha}$ , $\epsilon\tau\rho(\alpha\tau\eta\gamma\acute{\omicron}\varsigma)$ represents the abbreviation $\epsilon\tau\rho\varsigma$
[[ $a\beta\gamma$ ]]	The letters are deleted in the papyrus
$\overset{\sim}{a}\beta\gamma$	The letters are added above the line
$\langle a\beta\gamma \rangle$	The letters are added by the editor
$\{a\beta\gamma\}$	The letters are regarded as mistaken and rejected by the editor

Heavy arabic numerals refer to papyri printed in the volumes of *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*.

The abbreviations used are in the main identical with those in J. F. Oates *et al.*, *Checklist of Editions of Greek Papyri and Ostraca*, 4th edition (*BASP* Suppl. no. 7, 1992). It is hoped that any new ones will be self-explanatory.

# I. EURIPIDES

## 4545–4568 EURIPIDES, EXTANT PLAYS

Presented under these numbers are the remainder of the unpublished papyri of Euripides' extant plays identified thus far in the holdings of the Egypt Exploration Society (cf. LX **4012–16** intro.). Some were taken into account by Professor J. Diggle in the preparation of his OCT editions. These are indicated as such in their headings with the sigla (*II*<sup>1</sup> etc.) used to designate them in those editions. A few precisions and improvements in the reporting of their readings and alignment with the medieval MSS have been introduced in the notes here.

Among the new items, papyrus rolls of the late third–fourth centuries provide the first published ancient MSS of Euripides' *Cyclops* (**4545**) and *Troades* (**4564**), and only the second of *Rhesus*. **4546** (*Alceste*) gives Admetus' lines only, perhaps a private copy for someone learning his lines in the local play. **4549** (*Medea*) omits two lines previously suspect in the MS tradition of this confused speech, and uniquely transposes two others. The overlapping **4557–9** (*Hecuba*) agree among themselves in omitting three verses (756–9) at a point where the medieval tradition is fraught with disorder or lacunae. A number (**4549**, **4550**, **4554–5**, **4564**) provide examples of accented MSS of the dramas, or show a colometry differing from that of the medieval tradition (**4554**). Two join with papyri of Euripides already published (**4550** with P. Harris I 38 and P. Fitzw. Mus. Add 109; **4561** with VI **877**), while a number overlap with each other or already published papyri.

For a list of papyri of Euripides up to 1992 see O. Bouquiaux-Simon and P. Mertens, 'Les témoignages papyrologiques d'Euripide', in M. Capasso, ed., *Papiri letterari greci e latini*, Papyrologica Lupiensia 1 (1992) 96–107. The following table updates this list for the plays covered by the new fragments published here for the first time, amalgamating portions of the text witnessed with those of previously published papyri of Euripides. The numbers of Pack<sup>2</sup> or Mertens–Pack<sup>3</sup> are given where they have been assigned. For convenience of reference the titles are arranged alphabetically, rather than according to the traditional order of plays in the MSS of Euripides (as in the order of presentation below). The order is that of the lines in the play as witnessed by the papyri. Entries are repeated in italics where more than one section of the play is covered, in order to juxtapose overlapping papyrus witnesses to the text. Quotations of the text of Euripides in school texts (R. Criore, *ΣPE* 116 (1997) 53–60), anthologies, commentaries, and hypotheses are included, as well as ancient witnesses on parchment, but hypotheses, summaries, and commentaries on Euripidean plays are omitted (as constituting a special category of evidence attesting the text often implicitly or problematically: cf. J. Diggle, *ΣPE* 77 (1989) 1–11 = *Euripidea* (Oxford 1994) 327–40; M. van Rossum-Steenbeck, *Greek Readers' Digests?* (Leiden 1998) 1–52, 185–228), as are quotations in ancient authors on papyrus. BB = back blank.

As in the case of many known authors, the new papyri accord with their previously

[continues on p. 16]

TABLE 1. *Papyri of Euripides*

Play/Verses	(Mertens-)Pack <sup>2/(3)</sup>	$\Pi^{\text{Diggle}}$ (OCT)
<b><i>Alcestis</i></b>		
344–82 (desunt 369–73, 375, 377, 379, 381)	—	—
771(?), 772–3 (bis), 774–9	(378.1)	$\Pi^2$
1159–63	378	—
<b><i>Andromacha</i></b>		
5–28 (deest 7), 30–6, 39–48	379	$\Pi^2$
46–62	(379.1)	$\Pi^8$
87–91	—	—
93–9, 150–1(?)	—	—
346–69	(379.2)	$\Pi^3$
519–22, 558–63	—	—
748–51, 790–2	—	—
809–50, 851–91, etc.	—	—
907–14	380	$\Pi^4$
954–1022	381	$\Pi^5$
957–9, 988–90, etc.	382	$\Pi^6$
1009–16, 1061–2, etc.	(382.1)	—
1061–96	—	—
1082–1102, etc.	(382.2)	—
1100–37	(382.1)	—
1113–33	(382.2)	—
1134–42, 1164–72	383	$\Pi^7$
1239–42, 1273–6	382	$\Pi^6$
1280–8	(382.1)	—
1284–8 ( <i>coda</i> )	378	—
<b><i>Cyclops</i></b>		
455–71, 479–81, 484–96	—	—
<b><i>Hecuba</i></b>		
20–1? 503–4?	1571	—



Publication	Medium (→↓)	Date	Prov.
<b>4546</b>	pap. ?roll → BB	i BC/i	Oxy.
<b>4547</b>	pap. roll →	iv	Oxy.
P. Yale I 20 = P. Hib. I 25 (repeated coda, sch. ex.)	pap. sheet → BB (↓ ined. lit. text)	iii BC	Hibeh
<b>III 449</b>	pap. ?sheet (‘not a codex’: Turner, <i>Tjp.</i> 65)	iii	Oxy.
<b>4551</b>	pap. ?roll → BB	iv	Oxy.
<b>4552</b>	pap. roll. → BB	ii	Oxy.
<b>4553</b>	pap. codex	iv?	Oxy.
<b>XXXI 2543</b>	pap. roll → BB	ii	Oxy.
P. Berol. inv. 21237 ed. W. Luppe, <i>APF</i> 38 (1992) 7–10	pap. codex	v	Herm(opolis)
<b>4554</b>	pap. codex	v?	Oxy.
<b>4555</b>	pap. codex	vi	Oxy.
P. Harris I 39	pap. roll (→↓not stated)	iii	Oxy.?
<b>XXII 2335</b>	pap. roll ↓ (→ ined. doc., ii)	ii	Oxy.
P. Ross.Georg. I 8	parchm. codex	vii/viii	Sinai?
P. Berol. inv. 17021 ed. W. Müller, <i>FBSM</i> 6 (1964) 8–9 no. 1	pap. codex	v	Herm.
<b>4555</b>	parchm. cod.	vi/vii	Palestine, Bethlehem?
P. De Langhe ed. J. Mossay, <i>AC</i> 41 (1972) 500–518			
<b>4555</b>	pap. codex	v	Herm.
<i>P. De Langhe</i> P. Berol. inv. 13418 ed. G. Manteuffel, <i>JJP</i> 2 (1948) 84–7 (= Cavallo–Maehler <i>GBEBP</i> 22a) <i>P. Ross.Georg. I 8</i> <i>P. De Langhe</i> <i>P. Yale I 20 = P. Hib. I 25</i>			
<b>4545</b>	pap. roll → BB	iv	Oxy.
P. Fitzwilliam Mus. inv. 2 (tragic anthology?) ed. F. M. Heichelheim, <i>AJP</i> 61 (1940) 209–10	pap. roll (?→↓)	i/ii	?

Table 1 (*cont.*)

Play/Verses	(Mertens-)Pack <sup>2/(3)</sup>	$\Pi^{\text{Diggle}}$ (OCT)
<b><i>Hecuba</i></b> ( <i>cont.</i> )		
28–44	434 + 1704 = (452.1)	$\Pi^4$
216–231	2456 = (388.1)	—
223–7	(388.2)	$\Pi^5$
254–7	1567	$\Pi^3$
604–7	(388.3)	$\Pi^6$
651–69, etc.	(388.4)	$\Pi^7$
700–3, etc.	389	$\Pi^1$
709–22, etc.	—	—
710–38	(388.4)	$\Pi^7$
737–40	389	$\Pi^1$
739–51, etc.	(389.1)	$\Pi^8$
742–73 ( <i>desunt</i> 756–9)	(388.4)	$\Pi^7$
746–61 ( <i>desunt</i> 756–9)	—	—
[ <i>desunt</i> 756–9]	(389.1)	$\Pi^8$
765–84	(389.2)	$\Pi^9$
768–87	(389.1)	$\Pi^8$
782–94, 816–27	—	—
1252–70, 1271–80	390	$\Pi^2 + \Pi^{10}$
<b><i>Hercules</i></b>		
32–40	—	—
137–43, 146–60, 167–70, 238	1740 = (391.1)	cit.
551–60	—	—
1092–9	392	cit.
<b><i>Iphigenia in Tauris</i></b>		
53–66	434 + 1704 = (452.1)	cit.
174–7, 179–91, 245–55, 272–86, etc.	400	cit.
350–6	(400.01)	—
581–95, 600–29 ( <i>deest</i> 628)	400	cit.

Publication	Medium (→↓)	Date	Prov.
P. Hamb. II 118–19 (collection of prologues)	pap. roll ↓ (→ legal doc. P. Hamb. II 168)	iii–ii BC	?
P. Tebt. II 683 recto ed. F. Montanari, <i>Riv. Fil.</i> 115 (1987) 24–32, 44 <sup>1</sup> –3	pap. roll → (↓ alphabet)	i/ii	Tebtynis
XLV <b>3215</b> fr. 2 O. Berol. 12319 (sch. ex.) <b>4556</b>	pap. roll. → BB ostr. pap. roll. → (↓ unident. traces)	ii ii BC iii	Oxy. Philadelphieia Oxy.
<b>4557</b>	pap. roll. → (↓ some traces)	ii	Oxy.
VI <b>876</b> <b>4558</b> <b>4557</b>	pap. codex pap. codex	v vi	Oxy. Oxy.
VI <b>876</b> <b>4559</b> <b>4557</b> <b>4558</b> <b>4559</b> <b>4560</b>	pap. roll. → BB	iv	Oxy.
<b>4559</b> <b>4558</b> VI <b>877</b> + <b>4561</b>	pap. roll. →	ii/iii (↓ ined. sub-lit. text)	Oxy.
<b>4562</b> P. Hib. II 179 vid. M. Cropp, <i>ZPE</i> 48 (1982) 67–73	pap. roll. → BB pap. roll → (↓ unident. semi-cursive )	ii? iii BC	Oxy. Hibeh
<b>4563</b>	pap. ?roll. → (↓ ined. off. doc., ii/iii)	ii/iii	Oxy.
P. Heid. Siegmann 205	pap. roll (?→↓)	iii BC	Hibeh
P. Hamb. II 118–19 (collection of prologues) P. Hib. I 24 P. Köln V 211 + VII 303 P. Hib. I 24	pap. roll ↓ pap. roll. → ?BB pap. roll ↓ (→ doc.)	iii–ii BC iii BC iii–iv	? Hibeh ?

Table 1 (*cont.*)

Play/Verses	(Mertens-)Pack <sup>2/(3)</sup>	$\Pi^{\text{Diggle}}$ (OCT)
<b><i>Iphigenia in Tauris</i></b> ( <i>cont.</i> )		
946–55	(400.1)	—
1340–52, 1367–78	—	—
<b><i>Medea</i></b>		
1	(454.3)	cit.
5–12	401	$\Pi^1$
14–15	(1612.2)	—
20–6, 57–63	402	$\Pi^2$
131, 139–48	(402.1)	$\Pi^{10}$
410–27, 501–10, etc.	(420.1)	$\Pi^{12}$
507, 513–7, 545–60	403	$\Pi^3$
545–54	(420.1)	$\Pi^{12}$
547–50, 591–5, etc.	(403.1)	$\Pi^{13}$
710–15	404	$\Pi^4$
718–24, etc.	(404.1)	$\Pi^{11}$
719–23, etc.	405	$\Pi^{5a-c}$
[ <i>desunt</i> 725–6], [727–8 <i>post</i> 729], 729, 727–8, 730–5, 736–7(?)	(404.1)	$\Pi^{11}$
748(?)–52, etc.	405	$\Pi^{5c}$
825–40, etc.	406	$\Pi^6$
838–41	(420.1)	$\Pi^{12}$
866–78	406	$\Pi^6$
884–7	(420.1)	$\Pi^{12}$
841–65, etc.	426	$\Pi^7$

Publication	Medium (→↓)	Date	Prov.
BKT IX 34 (inv. 21133) <b>4565</b>	pap. roll → BB pap. roll. → BB	i/ii ii	Herm. Oxy.
P. IFAO inv. P.S.P. 248 ( <i>ἀρχή</i> & hypothesis) ed. Diggle OCT (1984) 91–2; cf. W. Luppe, <i>Anagenesis</i> 4.1 (1986) 37–58 + pll. II–IV	pap. roll → BB	ii	?
P. Didot pp. 16–18 (sch. ex. anthology)	pap. roll → (↓ Posidippus epigrams)	ii BC	Memphis
P. IFAO inv. 172 (adaptation) ed. M. Papathomopoulos, <i>Rech. Pap.</i> 2 (1962) 113–16	pap. sheet →	iv	?
XI <b>1370</b> fr. 1 (same codex with <i>Orestes</i> 445–1371 with lac.) <b>4548</b>	pap. codex pap. roll ↓ (→ ined. doc., ii/iii)	v iv	Oxy. Oxy.
BKT IX 122 (inv. 17018+21218+13231) BKT V 2 97–8 (inv. 13243) (= Cavallo–Maehler <i>GBEPP</i> 26a) <i>BKT IX</i> 122	pap. codex pap. codex	v v/vi	Herm. Herm.
P. Heid. inv. G 1385 ed. R. Seider, <i>ΣPE</i> 46 (1982) 33–6 III <b>450</b> <b>4549</b>	pap. roll → pap. roll. ↓ (→ ined. doc., ii/iii) pap. roll. ↓ (→ ined. lit. text, iii)	i BC iii iii	? Oxy. Oxy.
P. Harris I 38 + P. Fitzw. Mus. Add 109 + <b>4550</b> <b>4549</b> <b>4550</b>	pap. roll. → BB	ii	Oxy.
P. Ant. I 23 (with scholia) <i>BKT IX</i> 122 <i>P. Ant. I</i> 23 <i>BKT IX</i> 122	pap. codex	v/vi	Antinoopolis
P. Strassb. WG 304–7 recto (anthology of Euripides' lyrics) ed. W. Crönert, <i>Gött. Nachr.</i> (1922) 17–26; re-ed. N. Lewis, <i>Ét. Pap.</i> 3 (1936) 52–79; M. Fassino, <i>ΣPE</i> 127 (1999) 1–46	pap. roll → (↓ Pack <sup>2</sup> 1592)	iii/ii BC	?

Table 1 (*cont.*)

Play/Verses	(Mertens-)Pack <sup>2/(3)</sup>	$\Pi^{\text{Diggle}}$ (OCT)
<b>Medea</b> ( <i>cont.</i> )		
977-82	426	$\Pi^7$
1007-9	405	$\Pi^{5c}$
1024-89, etc.	—	—
1046-53	405	$\Pi^{5a}$
1054-6	(420.1)	$\Pi^{12}$
1057-62, etc.	407	$\Pi^8$
1059-64	(420.1)	$\Pi^{12}$
1086-92	407	$\Pi^9$
1087-1114	426	$\Pi^7$
1098-1103	(420.1)	$\Pi^{12}$
1119	—	—
1149-63, etc.	408	$\Pi^9$
1156-60, 1165-77, etc.	405	$\Pi^{5b}$
1171-90	408	$\Pi^9$
1191-9	405	$\Pi^{5b}$
1251-92	426	$\Pi^7$
1279-1328 ( <i>deest</i> 1300)	405	$\Pi^{5a}$
1345-6(?)	405	$\Pi^{5c}$
1389-1419	426	$\Pi^7$
1415-9	378	—
<b>Orestes</b>		
1	453	$\Pi^1$
6, 9-10	1592	$\Pi^3$
53-61, 89-97	409	$\Pi^3$
134-42	(409.1)	$\Pi^4$
196-216	(409.11)	$\Pi^5$
205 <sup>?</sup> , 208-25, 226-47	410	$\Pi^6$
268-9	1950	—
290-300, 304-9, etc.	(410.1) + (412.2)	$\Pi^{7a} + \Pi^{12}$
314-20	—	$\Pi^{20}$

Publication	Medium (→↓)	Date	Prov.
<i>P. Strassb. WG 304–7 recto</i> <b>4550</b>			
BKT IX 161 ident. W. Luppe, <i>APF</i> 41 (1995) 34–9 <i>P. Harris I 38</i> <i>BKT IX 122</i>	pap. roll → BB	iii BC	?
P. Univ. Coll. London ed. H. J. M. Milne, <i>CR</i> 49 (1935) 14 <i>BKT IX 122</i> <i>P. Univ. Coll. London</i> <i>P. Strassb. WG 304–7 recto</i> <i>BKT IX 122</i> <i>BKT IX 161</i>	parchm. codex	iv/v	Arsinoë
XXII <b>2337</b>	pap. roll ↓ (→ ined. doc., i)	i/ii	Oxy.
<i>P. Fitzw. Mus. Add 109</i> XXII <b>2337</b> <i>P. Fitzw. Mus. Add 109</i> <i>P. Strassb. WG 304–7 recto</i> <i>P. Harris I 38</i> <b>4550</b> <i>P. Strassb. WG 304–7 recto</i>			
P. Yale I 20 = P. Hib. I 25 (repeated coda)	pap. sheet → BB	iii BC	Hibeh
XXVII <b>2455</b> fr. 3 col. iii25 (ἀρχή & hypothesis)	pap. roll → BB	ii	Oxy.
P. Strassb. WG 307 verso (anthology) ed. B. Snell, <i>Hermes Einzelschr.</i> 5 (1937) 89–92	pap. roll ↓ (→ Pack <sup>2</sup> 426)	ii–i BC	?
XIII <b>1616</b> P. Köln VIII 131 (+ III 252) P. Laur. inv. III/908 ed. R. Pintaudi, <i>SCO</i> 35 (1985) 13–23; cf. V. Di Benedetto, <i>ibid.</i> 25–7	pap. codex pap. roll → BB pap. roll →↓?	v ii/i BC ii BC	Oxy. ? Fayum
P. Col. VIII 202	pap. roll (→↓ not stated)	i BC	?
XXIX <b>2506</b> fr. 26 col. ii 18–21 (comm. on lyric poets)	pap. roll → BB	ii	Oxy.
BKT IX 83 (inv. 21180+17051+17014) LX <b>4013</b>	pap. codex pap. roll → BB	vi i BC/i	Herm. Oxy.

Table 1 (*cont.*)

Play/Verses	(Mertens-)Pack <sup>2/(3)</sup>	$\Pi^{\text{Diggle}}$ (OCT)
<b>Orestes</b> ( <i>cont.</i> )		
321-30, 333-9	(410.1) + (412.2)	$\Pi^{7a} + \Pi^{12}$
338-43	411	$\Pi^8$
445-9, 469-74, 482-6, 508-12, etc.	402	$\Pi^9$
599-601 (+2 vv.)	—	—
685-90, 723-9	402	$\Pi^9$
754-64	412	$\Pi^{10}$
811-17	402	$\Pi^9$
835-46	(412.01)	$\Pi^{19}$
850-4	402	$\Pi^9$
867-81	(412.1)	$\Pi^{11}$
884-95	(410.1) + (412.2)	$\Pi^{7a} + \Pi^{12}$
896-8, 907-10	402	$\Pi^9$
918-27	(410.1) + (412.2)	$\Pi^{7a} + \Pi^{12}$
934-6	402	$\Pi^9$
939-54	—	$\Pi^{24}$
941-51, etc.	(412.21)	$\Pi^{13}$
945-8	402	$\Pi^9$
973-83	(412.21)	$\Pi^{13}$
986-1002	—	$\Pi^{21}$
990-3	—	$\Pi^{22}$
1062-85, 1087-90	413	$\Pi^{14}$
1155-6	1576	$\Pi^{15}$
1233-52	—	$\Pi^{23}$
1246-65, 1297-1305, 1334-45, 1369b-71	402	$\Pi^9$
1313-26, 1335-50, 1356-60	414	$\Pi^{16}$
1377-96 (deest 1394)	(414.01)	$\Pi^{17}$
1407-10, 1432-42, 1621-35, 1649-60	(414.02)	$\Pi^{18}$



Publication	Medium (→↓)	Date	Prov.
<i>BKT IX 83</i>			
MPER V 65–73 (with music) (= <i>GMAW</i> <sup>2</sup> 35)	pap. roll. → BB	c. 200 BC	Herm.
<b>XI 1370</b>	pap. codex	v	Oxy.
<b>4567</b>	pap. roll → BB	ii/iii	Oxy.
<i>XI 1370</i>			
P. Cairo JE 56224 ed. W. G. Waddell, <i>Ét. Pap.</i> 1 (1932) 15 no. 7	pap. roll. →↓?	i/ii	Oxy.
<b>XI 1370</b>			
P. Mich. 3735 ed. L. Koenen & P. J. Sijpesteijn, <i>ΣPE</i> 77 (1989) 261–6	pap. roll (→↓ not stated)	i BC	?
<b>XI 1370</b>			
PSI XV 1475 (ined.) mentioned by V. di Benedetto, <i>Eur. Orestes</i> (1965)	pap. roll. →↓?	i/ii	?
<i>BKT IX 83</i>			
<b>XI 1370</b>			
<i>BKT IX 83</i>			
<b>XI 1370</b>			
P. Duke inv. 615 ed. L. Pearson Smith, <i>ΣPE</i> 98 (1993) 15–18	pap. roll → BB	iii BC	?
<b>LIII 3716</b> (with stichometry)	pap. roll → BB	ii/i BC	Oxy.
<b>XI 1370</b>			
<b>LIII 3716</b>			
<b>LX 4014</b>	pap. roll → BB	ii	Oxy.
<b>LX 4015</b>	pap. roll → BB	i	Oxy.
P. Gen. inv. 91 ed. J. Nicole, <i>Rév. Phil.</i> 19 (1895) 105–8	pap. roll →↓?	ii/iii	Fayum
P. Ross. Georg. I 9 (Euripides anthology)	?	ii BC	?
<b>LX 4016</b>	pap. roll → (↓ ined. doc.)	ii	Oxy.
<b>XI 1370</b>			
<b>IX 1178</b>	pap. roll → (↓ not stated)	ii/i BC	Oxy.
<b>LIII 3717</b>	pap. roll ↓ (→ ined. doc. Antoninus Pius)	ii	Oxy.
<b>LIII 3718</b>	pap. codex	v	Oxy.

Table 1 (*cont.*)

Play/Verses	(Mertens-)Pack <sup>2/(3)</sup>	$\Pi^{\text{Diggle}}$ (OCT)
<b><i>Phoenissae</i></b>		
[deest 1–2], etc.	453	$\Pi^1$
[deest 1–2], etc.	(414.1)	$\Pi^{16}$
[deest 1–2], etc.	(414.2)	$\Pi^{17}$
3	1934	—
3	453	$\Pi^1$
3–14	(414.2)	$\Pi^{17}$
3–40	(414.1)	$\Pi^{16}$
31–5	415	$\Pi^{11}$
46–61	(414.2)	$\Pi^{17}$
50–69	(415.01)	$\Pi^{19}$
51–64	(414.1)	$\Pi^{16}$
106–18, 128–40	416	$\Pi^3$
171–85, etc.	417 + (420.21)	$\Pi^4$
182–90	(417.1)	$\Pi^{14}$
220–6	417 + (420.21)	$\Pi^4$
244–50	(417.11)	$\Pi^{20}$
280–98, etc. (desunt 291–2)	(417.2)	$\Pi^{13}$
307–10, etc.	418	$\Pi^8$
$\Sigma$ to 334–1108	419	$\Pi^6$
337–41	418	$\Pi^8$
337–51, 364–77, 379–92 ( <i>deest</i> 387)	(417.2)	$\Pi^{13}$
430–7, 461–7	—	$\Pi^{22}$
446–637 (adaptation)	420	—
469	—	—
493–503, etc.	(420.1)	$\Pi^{12}$
505–512	(420.1)	$\Pi^{12}$

Publication	Medium (→↓)	Date	Prov.
XXVII <b>2455</b> fr. 17 col. xx 290 + fr. 19.2 (ἀρχή & hypothesis)	pap. roll → BB	ii	Oxy.
XLVII <b>3321</b>	pap. codex	ii/iii	Oxy.
XLVII <b>3322</b>	pap. roll ↓ (→ ined. money accts.)	i/ii	Oxy.
O. Edfu III 326 (hymnic acclamation) ed. G. Manteuffel, <i>JJP</i> 3 (1949) 102–3 (= <i>Suppl. Hell.</i> 989)	ostrakon, private copy	ii/i BC	Edfu
XXVII <b>2455</b> fr. 17 col. xx 290 + fr. 19.2 XLVII <b>3322</b> XLVII <b>3321</b>			
P. Ant. II 74 (writ. ex.) XLVII <b>3322</b>	pap. sheet ↓ BB	vi/vii	Antinoë
LIII <b>3712</b> (writ. ex.) XLVII <b>3321</b>	pap. sheet → BB	ii	Oxy.
P. Lit. Lond. 75 (sch. ex.) re-ed. D. J. Mastronarde, <i>ZPE</i> 49 (1982) 7–14	opisth. ostrakon	ii BC	?
IX <b>1177</b> + LIII <b>3714</b>	pap. roll ↓	i BC/i	Oxy.
P. Kraus ed. L. Feinberg, <i>BASP</i> 12 (1975) 71–4 IX <b>1177</b> + LIII <b>3714</b>	pap. roll ?↓→	i BC	?
LIII <b>3713</b>	pap. roll ↓ (→ ined. informal, ii)	ii	Oxy.
BKT IX 72	pap. roll ↓ (→ list of owners)	iii	Herm.
MPER III 21	pap. ?sheet (‘not a codex’: Turner, <i>Typ.</i> 105)	vi/vii	?
P. Würzb. 1 MPER III 21 BKT IX 72	pap. codex	vi	Herm.
LX <b>4012</b>	parchm. codex	v	Oxy.
PSI XIII 1303	pap. ?sheet ↓ (→ admin. accts., ii)	ii/iii	Oxy.
P. Heidelberg G. 1744 (ined.) (sideways in right margin of doc.) ed. W. Luppe, <i>APF</i> 43 (1997) 96	pap. sheet	ii	?
BKT IX 122 BKT IX 122	pap. codex	v	Herm.

Table 1 (*cont.*)

Play/Verses	(Mertens-)Pack <sup>2/(3)</sup>	$\Pi^{\text{Diggle}}$ (OCT)
<b><i>Phoenissae</i></b> ( <i>cont.</i> )		
529-34	2642	—
533-4, 543-8	(420.1)	$\Pi^{12}$
552-75	(420.2)	$\Pi^{15}$
565-9, 591-7, 601-5	(420.1)	$\Pi^{12}$
606	1356	—
615-18	(420.1)	$\Pi^{12}$
625-35	(420.21) + 417	$\Pi^4$
646-57, etc.	421	$\Pi^2$
684, 690-703, 719-20, 722-39	(420.1)	$\Pi^{12}$
768-89, 793-806	422	$\Pi^{10}$
828-33, 846-51, 861-7, 898-900, 931-4	(420.1)	$\Pi^{12}$
1017-43	421	$\Pi^2$
1027-49	423	$\Pi^7$
1064-71	421	$\Pi^2$
1079-95	424	$\Pi^9$
1079-95	(420.1)	$\Pi^{12}$
1097-1107, etc.	425	$\Pi^1$
1113-29	(420.1)	$\Pi^{12}$
1126-37	425	$\Pi^1$
1327-37	—	—
1383-7, 1415-8	(425.1)	$\Pi^{18}$
1500-81, 1710-36 (with lac., deest 1732)	426	$\Pi^5$
colophon	(426.01)	$\Pi^{21}$
<b><i>Rhesus</i></b>		
48-96	427	$\Pi^2$
839-47	—	—
<b><i>Troades</i></b>		
340-6	—	—
876-9 (+ alphabet)	430	—

Publication	Medium (→↓)	Date	Prov.
P. Cairo JE 65445 ( <i>Un livre d'écolier</i> , ed. Guéraud & Jouguet)	pap. roll → BB	iii BC	Fayum
<i>BKT IX 122</i>			
<b>XLIV 3153</b>	pap. roll → BB	ii/iii	Oxy.
<i>BKT IX 122</i>			
P. Rain. 1.23 (Σ Pind. Pyth. 1.46–66)	pap. cod.	vi	?
<i>BKT IX 122</i>			
<b>IX 1177 + LIII 3714</b>			
P. Ryl. III 547 + II 224	pap. roll → ?BB	ii/iii	Oxy.
<i>BKT IX 122</i>			
P. Merton II 54 (sch. ex.)	pap. ?sheet ↓ (→ ined. κατ' ἀνδρα list)	ii	Arsinoite nome?
<i>BKT IX 122</i>			
<i>P. Ryl. III 547 + II 224</i>			
PSI XI 1193	pap. roll → BB	ii	Oxy.
<i>P. Ryl. III 547 + II 224</i>			
P. Berol. inv. 11868 ed. G. Manteuffel, <i>JJP</i> 2 (1948) 81–4	pap. roll → ?BB	ii	?
<i>BKT IX 122</i>			
MPER V 74–77 (sch. ex.)	wooden tablet verso (recto: Pack <sup>2</sup> 227)	iv/v	?
<i>BKT IX 122</i>			
<i>MPER V 74–77</i>			
<b>4566</b>	pap. roll → BB	i	Oxy.
<i>BKT IX 111</i>	pap. codex	vi	Herm.
P. Strassb. WG 304–7 recto (anthology of Euripides' lyrics) ed. W. Crönert, <i>Gött. Nachr.</i> (1922) 17–26; re-ed. N. Lewis, <i>Ét. Pap.</i> 3 (1936) 52–79; cf. M. Fassino, <i>ZPE</i> 127 (1999) 7–9	pap. roll → (↓ Pack <sup>2</sup> 1592)	iii/ii BC	?
<b>LIII 3715</b>	pap. roll → BB	ii	Oxy.
P. Achmîm 4	pap. codex	iv/v	Panopolis
<b>4568</b>	pap. roll → BB	iii	Oxy.
<b>4564</b>	pap. roll → BB	ex. iii/iv	Oxy.
<i>BKT V 2 98</i> (sch. ex.)	wooden tablet codex	i	?

published counterparts in agreeing inconsistently both with the traditions represented by the medieval MSS and among themselves. They contain interesting variants alongside distinct errors, with value differing according to text-type. Palaeographical analysis is in some cases a means of establishing text-type. The papyri exhibit numerous variations of the type termed ‘respectable variants’ (M. W. Haslam on XLIV **3152** introd.), i.e. of the type (i) not grammatically incorrect, and (ii) not against the meaning of the text, in addition to (iii) purely orthographic variations and (iv) distinct errors. The new fragments bear out the expectation that variations of types (i) and (ii) are more likely to be witnessed by papyri palaeographically and codicologically identifiable as professionally produced than do those that conversely point to the school room or private production as their origin; these typically yield a higher portion of discrepancies in categories (iii) and (iv). **4546** may be taken as an obvious example.

Professor Diggle’s OCT has been used for collation throughout, and for supplying the text in the missing portions for purpose of illustration and to represent plausible spacing and layout, except where the text preserved by the papyrus was divergent or insufficiently extensive. Occasionally we have supplied readings in the missing portions different from Diggle’s text, where demanded by spacing, context, or the textual tradition witnessed (see e.g. **4545** on v. 471). On the textual tradition of Euripides see H. Erbse in H. Hunger et al., *Geschichte der Textüberlieferung i* (Zurich 1968); V. Di Benedetto, *La tradizione manoscritta Euripidea* (Padova 1965). For individual cruces: F. H. M. Blaydes, *Adversaria critica in Euripidem* (Halis Saxonum 1901), J. Diggle, *Studies on the Text of Euripides* (Oxford 1981), id. *Euripidea* (Oxford 1994), and the special studies on individual plays. For assessment of the relation of the papyri to the medieval tradition see B. E. Donovan, *Studies in the Papyri of Euripides from Oxyrhynchus* (Diss., Yale 1966), id. *Euripides Papyri i* (New Haven and Toronto 1969); A. Ponzio, ‘La tradizione papiracea della Medea di Euripide’, *Analecta Papyrologica* 8–9 (1996–7) 95–142; M. W. Haslam on P. Oxy. XLVII **3321–2**, LIII **3712–19**, and LX **4012–16**.

D. OBBINK

**4545.** EURIPIDES, *CYCLOPS* 455–71, 479–81, 484–96

104/Dec.23

14.5 × 16.5 cm

Fourth century  
Plate I

The lower parts of two consecutive columns originally of 23 lines each, constituting the first papyrus of *Cyclops* to be published. The lower margin measured at least 3 cm and intercolumnar space at least 4 cm. Height of the roll may be estimated at 22 cm; the length necessary for the 709 lines of *Cyclops* is 5.5 m, occupying perhaps 31 columns of text (depending on the colometry of the choruses elsewhere). The hand is a superb large-sized capital, slightly sloping to the right, similar to P. Chester Beatty XI (Cavallo–Maehler, *GBEBP* 2b) or XXXIV **2699** (*GMAW*<sup>2</sup> 49). In comparison with similar scripts of the Severe Style the hand of our papyrus stands out by the size of its writing and its marked shading

(horizontals thinner than verticals, some diagonals thinner than others). Paragraphus is used, possibly to mark off metrical sections: after 486 (anapaestic runs concluded by paroemiac), and after 494 (lyric strophe against anapaests). There is apparently no example of this use of the paragraphus in a dramatic papyrus but it is in full accord with the statements of Hephaestion (p. 75, 15–18) and with what we find later in Triclinius (cf. e.g. schol. T on Aesch. *Ag* 40b). Other lectional signs are a diaeresis in 495 and a mysterious dot in 492 (and again in 495?), probably all by the first hand. Iota adscript is written in 462 and 490. The writing is along the fibres. The back is blank.

The papyrus confirms two minor adjustments of the text of L(aurent. pl. 32.2) in 491 and 495 but shares L's error in 458. In 461 the papyrus introduces a new reading which is doubtless inferior to L. The spurious vv. 480–2 and the *παρεπιγραφή* before 488 are already present but the latter is marked off as such by indentation.

In 482–96 we get a valuable attestation of the ancient colometry, which differs from Diggle's text at 492/3.

## Col. i

(4 lines missing)

[fr. 1] 455 [ακρεμων ελαια εστιν εν δομοισι] τις  
[ον φασγανωι τωιδ εξαποξυνας α]κρον  
[εσ πυρ καθησω καιθ οταν κεκαυμ]ενον  
[ιδω νιν αρας θερμον εις μεσην β]αλων  
[Κυκλωπος οψιν ομμα τ εκτηξω π]υρι  
460 [ναυπηγίαν δ ωσει τις αρμοζ]ων ανηρ  
[διπλοιν χαλινοιν τρυπανον τ]ροχηλατει  
[ουτω κυκλωσω δαλον εν φαεσ]φορωι  
[Κυκλωπος οψει και συνανανω] κορας  
[ιου ιου ]  
465 [γεγηθα μαινομεσθα τοις ευρημασ]ιν  
[καπειτα και σε και φιλους γεροντα] τε  
[νεωσ μελαινης κοιλον εμβησας σ]καφος  
[διπλαισι κωπαισ τησδ αποστελω] χθονοσ  
[εστ ουν οπως αν ωσπερει σπονδης θ]ξου  
470 [καγω λαβοιμην του τυφλοντος ομμ]ατα  
[δαλου φονου γαρ τουδε κοινωνειν θε]λω  
] ]

Col. ii

(5 lines missing)

[fr. 2]	479	το[υς ενδον οντας ου μονος σωθησομαι]
	480	και[τοι φυγοιμ αν κακβεβηκ αντρου μυχων]
	481	αλ[λ ου δικαιον απολιποντ εμους φιλους]
		(2 ll. lost)
[fr. 1]	484	ταχθει[ς δαλου κωπην οχμασαι]
	485	Κυκλω[πος εσω βλεφαρων ωσας]
		λαμπραν [οψιν διακναισει]
		ωιδη ε[νδοθεν]
		σιγα σιγα και δ[η μεθυων]
		αχαριν κελαδ[ον μουσιζομενος]
	490	[ς]καιος απωι[δος και κλαυσομενος]
	491	χωρει πετρ[ων εξω μελαθρων]
	492	φερε νιγ κωμ[οις]
	492/3	παιδευσωμεν [τον απαιδευτον]
	494	παντως μελλει [τυφλος ειναι]
	495	μακαρ οστις ευια[ζει]
		[βο]τρυων φιλαις[ι πηγαις]

458 βαλων L: βαλώ Pierson (see Seaford ad loc.). Failure to recognise the correct word division in the next line (ομμα τ') might have contributed to the error: L read ὄμματ', and the papyrus may well have intended it.

461 τ]ροχηλατει is a unique reading: κωπηλατει L. L's κωπηλατει, suitable to the nautical imagery (cf. also 484 below), is clearly right (for the meaning see Hom. *Od.* 9. 383ff.). τροχηλατει, the *lectio facilior*, might have suggested itself to someone who supposed it to mean 'to turn round like a wheel'. It is a more obvious verb for the movement of a drill than the rare κωπηλατειν, and also a more familiar one (cf. E. *Or.* 36, *El.* 125, always metaphorical). Thus far this papyrus is alone in attesting it.

471 φονου with L; Diggle prints πόνου after Nauck.

480-1 These verses (together with 482, lost in the gap between fr. 2 and 3) are most probably an interpolation (see Seaford ad loc.). The papyrus shows that they were present already in antiquity.

491 χωρει Tr<sup>2</sup>: χ- <γ> L.

492 νν L: ννν conjectured by Diggle.

492 ff. L divides φέρε . . . παιδύσωμεν / τὸν ἀπαίδευτον / πάντως κτλ. (as printed in modern editions). This is probably a case of the influence of Triclinius on the exemplar of L (see *ZPE* 63 (1986) 6 n. 16). The result would be to effect a παρατέλευτον: see O. L. Smith, *Studies in the Scholia on Aeschylus* (Leiden 1975) 157.

492/3 There is a trace of ink before the second letter, as possibly also in 495. The one here is a firmly made round dot. These are perhaps line-spacing dots (*GMAW*<sup>2</sup> 4 n. 7) covered by letters in some lines.

495 μακαρ papyrus, Hermann: μακάριος L. There is a low dot below ρ.

H.-C. GÜNTHER



**4546.** EURIPIDES, *ALCESTIS* 344–82 WITH OMISSIONS

103/216(a)

7.3 × 15.1 cm

First century BC/first century AD  
Plate II

Full height of column, with 30 lines, showing the top and seemingly the bottom margin. 355–6 show line-ends and margin at right, but the left side is missing. The text is written along the fibres in an unsteady, yet carefully executed and narrowly spaced upright capital (the back is blank). In particular it is noteworthy in that it preserves Admetus' lines only, omitting those of the chorus and Alcestis at 369–73 and Alcestis' in stichomythia at 375, 377, 379, 381. Note short height of column (13.3 cm) and roll (c. 15 cm). The hand betrays a certain insecurity through the presence of some overwritten strokes, unevenness in the height of some letters, and the occasional wavering. Yet the careful, upright quality of the shapes and consistent rotundity seem to show a practised writer, rather than a learner at work, who produces a 30-line column which in the brief compass is closely and carefully written.

It is difficult to characterise the hand as anything other than a book-hand. It has some affinity for XXX **2508** 'Elegiacs (Archilochus?)', written on the back of a document of the first century AD and datable also to the first century, though as Lobel cautions: 'the clumsiness of the writing may make it look earlier than it is.' The letter shapes (especially triangular  $\alpha$  with cross-stroke that meets the left arm above the foot and is sometimes near horizontal,  $\mu$  in four movements,  $\gamma$  with bowl in one separate movement balanced on a stem) suggest a date in the first century BC or the first half of the first century AD. An instructive parallel is P. Fay. 7 (Homer, *Od.* VI, found with Augustan documents) = Roberts, *GLH* 9b, which is more calligraphic, but compares well in its  $\alpha$  with finial on left foot, and also shows the closed  $\epsilon$ , together with a 'sometimes awkward grouping of letters' and 'a general air of angularity' (Roberts). For hands from Oxyrhynchus of Julio-Claudian date see also II **282** (complaint about wife, 30–35 AD, pl. VII, *GLH* 10b); cf. II **216** (rhet. ex., *GLH* 10a), IV **686–8** (Hom. *Il.*, pl. VII); IX **1177** + LIII **3714** (Eur. *Phoen.*; Augustan document pasted on front, plate in B. E. Donovan, *Euripides Papyri* pl. I no. 3, and same MS as LIII **3714**). Note also top arm of  $\kappa$  written almost horizontally, with the bottom arm sometimes connecting half way along it. Left leg of  $\alpha$  sometimes close to vertical (e.g. 350). Bowls of  $c$  and  $\epsilon$  full and round but falling forward, the cap a flattish forward falling stroke which in  $\epsilon$  is almost closed, i.e. often connects at tip with the cross-bar, which is written somewhat higher than centre, giving overall a top-heavy, unbalanced impression. Otherwise the writer models round letters, especially  $o$ ,  $\theta$ , and  $\phi$ , on the model of a perfect circle. The writer aims for bilinearity, with violation only by  $\phi$ . The only lectional sign in evidence is an apostrophe marking elision in 344. Elsewhere elision is effected but not marked.

The fact that Admetus' lines alone were copied makes it unlikely that there were any speaker changes or *notae personarum*, unless these lines were differently assigned than elsewhere in the tradition. The interventions of Alcestis and the chorus might have been signalled by *paragraphoi*, now lost. Omission of the chorus' and Alcestis' lines, together with

the unorthodox character of the hand, erratic orthography and unique variants might point toward a non-professional but competently produced copy for special use. Copying of Admetus' lines only might suggest someone who wanted them for a specific purpose. Learning the lines in the local play? An anthology of excerpts? If more than one column was written, it is unlikely that just this speech of Admetus was copied, since the line-count from its beginning at v. 328 fails to tally with the top of a hypothetical preceding column of 30 lines, while this column begins in the middle of a sentence. Were only Admetus' lines from the entire play written? His lines before 344 (the top of the column here) add up to exactly 30.

Adm		[στεφανους τε μο]υσαν θ' η κατειχ εμ[ουc δομουc]
345		[ου γαρ ποτ ουτ αν] βαρβιτου θιγοιμ ε[τι] [ουτ αν φρεν εξ]αιραμι προς Λιβυ[ν λακειν] [αυλον cu γαρ μο]υ τερμιν εξειλου [βιου] [coφη δε χειρι τεκτ]ονων δεμαc το co[ν] [εικαcθεν εν λε]κτροισιν εγγραφ[
350		[ωι προcπεcou]μαι και περιπτυξω[ [ονομα καλων co]ν την φιλην εν αγκα[λαιc] [δοξω γυναικα κ]αιπερ ουκ εχω[ν εχειν] [ψυχραν μεν οιμ]αι τερψιν αλλ ομωc [ψυχης απαντλοιην α]ν εν δ ον[ει]ραξιιν
355		[φοιτωca μ ευφραιν]οιc αν ηδυ γαρ φιλουc [καν νυκτι λευccειν ο]ντιν αν παρα χρονον [ει δ Ορφεωc μοι γλωc]ca κα[ι με]λο[c] παρη[ν] [ωc την κορην Δημη]τροc .[. .] . ν[η]c ποc[ιν] [υμνοισι κηληcαντ]α c εξ [Αιδο]υ λαβ[ειν]
360		[κατηλθον αν και] μ [ο]υθ ο Π[λουτωνοc κ]υων [ουθ ουπι κωπηι ψυχ]οπομποc α[ν Χαρ]ω[ν] [εcχ αν πριν εc φωc con καταcτ]η[caι] βι[ον] [αλλ ουν εκειce προcδοκα μ] οταν θ[ανω]
		(364 abraded)
365		[εν ταιcιν αυταιc γ]αρ μ ε[πιcκηψω] κεδροισ[ι] [coι τουcδε θειναι πλευρα] τ εκτ[ειναι] πελαc [πλευροισι τοιc coic μ]ηδε γαρ θα[νων ποτε]
368		[cou χωριc ειην της μον]ηc πιcτηc ε[μοι]
Cho./Alc		(369–73 om.)
Adm	374	[και νυν γε φημι και τελευ]τηcω ταδε

Alc		(375 om.)
Adm	376	[δέχομαι φίλον γε δωρον] ἐκ φίλης χε[ρος]
Alc		(377 om.)
Adm	378	[πολλή μ αναγκη σου γ απε]στερημε[νοις]
Alc		(379 om.)
Adm	380	[οιμοι τι δρασω δητα σου μονο]υμενος
Alc		(381 om.)
Adm	382	[αγου με συν κοι προς θεων] αγου κα[τω]

344 *θ'* pap., VLPQ; omitted by BO.

345 Elision after *θιγομι* effected but not (like *θ'* in 344) marked.

346 *ῥεξ]αιραμι* (the supplement probable but not certain) is unique at a point where trouble in the text is signalled by variance in the tradition: *ἐξάιροιμι* BOV and *ἸΣ<sup>b</sup>: ἐξάρομι* LP, on the basis of which Wakefield conjectured *ἐξάραμι* (accepted by Diggle), since the Σ's paraphrase, *οὐ πείσαιμι' ἂν τήν ἐμὴν φρένα λακεῖν*, seems to suggest the aorist. If the scribe intended the aorist, i.e. if *ι* in the papyrus' reading is assumed to have been transposed (as seems likely), it may be taken as confirming Wakefield's conjecture, or at least providing qualified support, insofar as it contains the aorist stem.

347 *μο]ν* pap., BOVLPQ, printed by Diggle: *μοι* conjectured by Hermann and Earle. But this is then followed by a Bophocles-like error: *τερμιν* for the MSS' *τέρψιν* (a confusion possibly induced by familiarity with Lat. *terminus*?). The writer successfully executed the word *τέρψιν* in 353.

At the end, *βίου* was omitted by BO, but spacing for it is consistent with that of the other expected line-ends, and at other points of divergence the papyrus text follows V or LP against BO.

348 *δεμας το σο]ν* pap., VLP and gE, printed by Diggle: *τὸ σὸν δέμας* BO.

349 *εγγραφ[*: Presumably the papyrus read *εγγραφ[ησεται*, a unique reading, which fails to produce good sense. BOVLPQ transmit *ἐκταθήσεται*.

350 *περιπτυξω]ν* pap.? *περιπτύσσων* BOVLPQ. The future participle is conceivable but unnecessary and probably a slip.

353 Spacing suggests that the papyrus read *μέν* against the (unmetrical) *μὲν οὖν* transmitted by gV (*μὲν* om. gE).

*οιμ]αι* pap., BOVLPQ (also attested by the gnomologia gVgE?): *οἶδα* conjectured by Elmsley.

355 *ἴλουσ* pap., V and gE, printed by Diggle: *φίλοις* BOLP: *φίλω* gV: *φίλος* conjectured by Musgrave. The papyrus provides welcome confirmation.

356 *παρα* pap., otherwise unattested and without sense, no doubt a phonetic confusion: *παρήν* BOVLPQ.

357 *γλωσ]α* presumably pap., with BOV and gBbE: *γλώττα* LP, an Atticised spelling. Later in the line there is enough of *ο* to lead one to believe that *μέλος* was written, as in BOVLPQ and gB, and not *μέλη* as quoted in gE, either in hendiadys or with the generalising function of a singular noun.

358 Alignment of ]*τροσ* with ]*α κα[ι* in the line above gives sufficient space almost to guarantee that the papyrus read *ὡς τήν* with BOVLPQ against Riske's emendation *ὡστ' ἦ* adopted by Diggle—unless *ὡστε ἦ* was written in scriptio plena, but elsewhere the scribe elides.

369–82 Omitted are the chorus' lines 369–70, and Alcestis' lines at 371–3, and then her lines in stichomythia with Admetus at 375, 377, 379, and 381. Yet these lines seem necessary and integral. When they are omitted, the remaining lines copied do not give a syntactically complete soliloquy by Admetus. Why were they omitted? Hardly mechanical scribal error. It is difficult to get beyond the idea that at some stage in the tradition, the omissions were intentional. Why? To create an anthology of excerpts? And why copy Admetus' lines only? One might think of a copy intended for someone memorising Admetus' lines. But would not someone using the text to practise Admetus' part need Alcestis' and the chorus' lines for his cue?

376 BOVQ, added by a corrector of L, accepted by Diggle: omitted by LP. The papyrus provides ancient testimony for its presence, at a point where, without it, Alcestis' lines before and after could be read as continuous.

D. OBBINK

**4547.** EURIPIDES, *ALCESTIS* 771?, 772–3 *bis*, 774–9

36 4B.99/G(1–4)c  
*IT*<sup>2</sup> Diggle  
 M.–P. 378.1

3.4 × 4.9 cm

Late second or third century

In this small fragment parts of the beginnings of eleven lines from *Alcestis* are represented. Of the first of these, only two tiny dots of ink remain. The other ten lines cover lines 772–9. Lines 772–3 are repeated.

The text is written along the fibres in a clear, medium-sized hand. Broad letters, such as η, Δ, Ν, and τ, markedly contrast with the narrower ones, such as ο, ρ, and c: γ and ρ have long tails. ω has two pronounced loops, separately penned, raised high in the centre. As an example of the Severe Style of the second to fourth centuries, the hand bears some comparison with XXVII **2463** (commentary on a poetic text?), especially in its uprightness, but with a more vertically compressed quality (e.g. in α and Δ). As with the hand of **2463**, that of the present fragment is more upright than later examples of this type of handwriting, with only a slight slope to the right.

The change of speaker at line 773b is indicated by the paragraphus below line 772b, and the remains of a marginal note of *dramatis persona*, Her(acles), at a point where we would expect it. Were these indications already present at 772a–773a? Elision is effected and marked by apostrophe in lines 776 and 779. High stop in 775. There is no further evidence of lectional aids. Iota adscript was not written in 778, the only expected place where we can judge. Two small traces of ink occur in the margin, of which little more than 0.5 cm remains, opposite the start of lines 777 and 778, no doubt no more than accidental blots. No variants from the modern text appear.

The verso contains slight remains of a text of uncertain content, in an untidy, undistinguished, medium-sized hand, probably dating from the third century.

	. . . . .
	]. [.] [
772a	[cτυγ]ω δι[καιως εν κακοις αφιγμενον]
773a	[ουτο]c τι [cεμνον και πεφροντικος βλεπειc]
772b	cτυγω δι[καιως εν κακοις αφιγμενον]
773b	[H] <sup>ρ</sup> ουτοc τι [cεμνον και πεφροντικος βλεπειc]
774	ου χρη cκ[υθρωπον τοιc ξενοιc τον προσπολον]
775	ειναι· δεχ[εcθαι δ ευπροσηγορω φρενι]

ευ δ' ανδρ [εταιρον δεσποτου παρονθ ορων]  
 στυγνω π[ροσωπω και συνωφρυωμενω]  
 δεχηθ θυρα[ιου πηματος σπουδην εχων]  
 δευρ' ε[λθ οπως αν και σοφωτερος γενη]

773b Though far from certain, the trace in the margin is probably part of ρ, from ηρ = Ἡρ(ακλής).

777 Were it not for the evidence of the following line δεχηθ θυρα[, where no iota adscript is to be seen, the end of this line could be read as -ωιπ[, with ι and one upright of π; however, both uprights should probably be read as π, with no ι.

D. HUGHES

#### 4548. EURIPIDES, *MEDEA* 131, 139–48

36.4B.110/D(1–2)a  
 P<sup>10</sup> Diggle  
 M.–P. 402.1

3 × 8.6 cm

Fourth century

The text is on the vertical fibres of a ragged and damaged piece of papyrus which has been patched up by some additional strips affixed to the recto, which carries some remnants of a documentary text in a second/third-century cursive, and a kollesis, both now partly obscured by the repair strips. To the lower left and extreme right of the Euripides some alien traces of ink are visible which belong to writing on these repair strips.

The text is written in a now brown ink in a rough hand of the Severe Style of the fourth century. It is smallish and mainly upright, with only a slight slope to the right. Generally, it is too faint and ill-preserved to permit a detailed study of the letter forms, in some cases only the merest outline remaining. There is some contrast between broad and narrow letters, and some difference in the thicker vertical and finer horizontal strokes may be noted, particularly in ε and π.

The first line which is positively identifiable is 139, the start of the lament of the Trophos. Above this, all that remains of the inset lines of the chorus, from 131 to 138, is part of the abbreviation χ<sup>ο</sup>; one diagonal stroke from × survives, inset about 1.5 cm from the margin. There is room for six or seven lines between this trace of × and line 139. The abbreviation χ<sup>ο</sup> appears again at the foot of the fragment, almost exactly aligned below the one at the top of the papyrus.

In addition to the chorus, the other two speakers in the piece, the Trophos and Medea, are indicated by marginal abbreviations. Change of speaker is shown by paragraphus at line 143. At line 141, there is possibly part of a rough breathing, and an apostrophe marking elision, and a high stop in 145. No other lectional aids are in evidence. One unique variant (140) is to be noted.

131  $\chi^{\circ}$   $\epsilon\kappa\lambda\nu\omicron\nu\ \phi\omega\nu\alpha\nu\ \epsilon\kappa\lambda\nu\omicron\nu\ \delta\epsilon\ \beta\omicron\alpha\nu]$   
(c. 6 lines missing)

139  $\overline{\text{Τροφ}}$   $\omicron\upsilon\kappa\ \epsilon\iota\iota\ \text{[}\delta\omicron\mu\omicron\iota\ \phi\rho\omicron\upsilon\delta\alpha\ \tau\alpha\delta\ \eta\delta\eta\text{]}$   
140  $\omicron\varsigma\ \mu\epsilon\nu\ \text{[}\gamma\alpha\rho\ \epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\ \lambda\epsilon\kappa\tau\rho\alpha\ \tau\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\nu\omega\nu\text{]}$   
 $\eta\ \delta'\ \epsilon\nu\ \theta\text{[}\alpha\lambda\alpha\mu\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \tau\eta\kappa\epsilon\iota\ \beta\iota\omicron\tau\eta\nu\text{]}$   
 $\delta\epsilon\varsigma\pi\omicron\iota\text{[}\nu\alpha\ \phi\iota\lambda\omega\nu\ \omicron\upsilon\delta\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \omicron\upsilon\delta\epsilon\nu\text{]}$   
 $\overline{\text{παραθα}}$   $\text{[}\lambda\pi\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\eta\ \phi\rho\epsilon\nu\alpha\ \mu\upsilon\theta\omicron\iota\varsigma\text{]}$   
 $\overline{\text{Μη}}$   $\delta^{\delta}$   $\alpha\iota\alpha\iota\ \delta\iota\text{[}\alpha\ \mu\omicron\nu\ \kappa\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\alpha\varsigma\ \phi\lambda\omicron\zeta\ \omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\iota\alpha\text{]}$   
145  $\beta\alpha\iota\eta\ \tau\text{[}\iota\ \delta\epsilon\ \mu\omicron\iota\ \zeta\eta\nu\ \epsilon\tau\iota\ \kappa\epsilon\rho\delta\omicron\varsigma\text{]}$   
 $\phi\epsilon\nu\ \phi\epsilon\text{[}\nu\ \theta\alpha\nu\alpha\tau\omega\iota\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\upsilon\varsigma\alpha\iota\mu\alpha\nu\text{]}$   
 $\text{[}\beta\text{]}\iota\text{[}\omicron\text{]}\tau\alpha\nu\ \varsigma\text{[}\tau\upsilon\gamma\epsilon\rho\alpha\nu\ \pi\rho\omicron\lambda\iota\pi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\alpha\text{]}$   
 $\chi^{\circ}$   $\text{[}\alpha\iota\epsilon\varsigma\ \omega\ \text{Ζ}\epsilon\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \text{Γ}\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \phi\omega\varsigma\text{]}$   
[

140  $\omicron\varsigma$  is a new reading:  $\tau\delta\nu$  HE, already conjectured by Musgrave:  $\delta$  QLP and H<sup>s</sup>.  $\delta\epsilon\ \mu\epsilon\nu$  in itself makes perfect sense and metre. But demonstrative  $\delta\epsilon$  would not be expected in Euripides (cf. KG II 228).

141 Part of the vertical stroke of a breathing may remain above  $\eta$ . The papyrus accords with the MSS in  $\eta\ \delta$ , not carrying the Doric  $\hat{\alpha}$   $\delta'$  preferred by Murray.

144 Again the papyrus agrees with the MSS tradition, without the addition of Murray  $\langle\hat{\omega}\ \text{Ζ}\epsilon\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \text{Γ}\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \phi\hat{\omega}\varsigma\rangle$ . After  $\alpha\iota\alpha\iota$  Medea continues with  $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\ \mu\omicron\nu\ \kappa\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \kappa\tau\lambda.$ , all written on one line;  $\alpha\iota\alpha\iota$  *extra metrum*, presumably.

D. HUGHES  
A. NODAR

**4549.** EURIPIDES, *MEDEA* 718–35 (desunt 725–6, 727–8 post 729), 736–7(?)

36 4B.110/H(1–3)c  
*Π*<sup>11</sup> Diggle  
M.–P. 404.1

2.5 × 9.3 cm

Third century

This narrow strip of papyrus has parts of the ends of eighteen lines from the top of a column. Just over 1 cm of the upper margin remains. The text is written across the fibres in a smallish, neat hand, of the Severe Style with a slight slope. On the recto there is another book-hand of a similar type, but larger: mainly upright, with only a slight slope, comparable to XXXI 2538 (pll. VI and VII). Its  $\eta$ ,  $\nu$ , and  $\pi$  are broad, contrasting with the narrower  $\epsilon$ ,  $\theta$ ,  $\omicron$ , and  $\varsigma$ . This text, of an uncertain category, should be dated to the end of the second century. For the fragment of the *Medea* on the verso, a third-century date would be suitable.

The lines contained in the papyrus are 718 to 724, 729, 727 to 728, 730 to 735, plus two further lines represented by meagre traces. 725 and 726 have been omitted, while 727–8 have been displaced. 728 is present, we believe, with a new reading for the end of the line, possibly confirmed by the scholia. The speech of Aegeus, from 719 to 730, is somewhat confused and patently repetitious if the MS tradition is followed. Kirchhoff condemned 725 to 728, which Murray retained with the explanation *sed personae congrua iteratio*. The papyrus may appear to be an improvement on the MSS, but is still not very satisfactory; the sequence 729, 727 is perhaps equally repetitious, with *αὐτή* appearing twice. Certainly nothing is lost by the omission of 725 and 726, except the repetition of the sentiments, and Diggle follows our papyrus in excising these two lines. The papyrus overlaps at 720–1 and 723 with P. Harris I 38 fr. 1 (Π<sup>5a</sup>).

Apart from accents at lines 728 and 734, there are no lectional aids. With the exception of line 728, and the general re-arrangement of the lines, there are no variants from the MS tradition.

718 [σπειραι σε θηρω τοιαδ οιδ]α φαρμα[κα]  
 [πολλων εκατι τηνδε κοι δ]ουναι χα[ρην]  
 720 [γυναι προθυμος ειμι πρω]τα μεν θ[εων]  
 [επειτα παιδων ων επαγγελ]λη γον[ας]  
 [εσ τουτο γαρ δη φρουδος ειμι] πας εγ[ω]  
 [ουτω δ εχει μοι σου μεν ελθο]υσης χ[θονα]  
 724 [πειρασομαι σου προξενειν δ]ικαιος [ων]  
 729 [εκ τηςδε δ αυτη γης απαλλας]σου πο[δα]  
 727 [αυτη δ εανπερ εις εμους ελθ]ης δομ[ους]  
 728 [μενεις ακυλος κου σε μη προ]δῶ πὸτ[ε]  
 730 [αναιτιος γαρ και ξενους ει]αι θελ[ω]  
 [εσται ταδ αλλα πιςτις ει γε]ροιο μοι  
 [τουτων εχοιμ αν παντα προ]ς σεθεν κα[λως]  
 [μων ου πεποιθας η τι κοι το δυ]σχερες  
 [πεποιθα Πελιου δ εχθρος εστ]ί μοι δομο[ς]  
 735 [Κρεων τε τουτοις δ ορκιοις μ]εν ζυγεις  
 ].....[  
 ]...[

721 επαγγελ]λη: ἐπαγγέλλη(ι) BDALP and V<sup>2</sup>: -έλη CEV: ἀπαγγέλλη O.

725–8 Kirchhoff deleted these lines.

727–8 precede 729 in ΩLP. On the authority of the present papyrus and grounds of sense Diggle adopts the order 729, 727, 728, 730. 729 was deleted by Nauck.

728  $\pi\rho\sigma]: We have supplemented on the basis of the  $\Sigma$  ad loc.:  $\kappa\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\epsilon\ \mu\eta\ \mu\epsilon\theta\omega\ \tau\upsilon\nu\ \pi\rho\delta\omega$ . The MSS (BOCDELP) read  $\mu\epsilon\theta\omega\ \tau\upsilon\nu$  here, and the overlapping papyri do not preserve this part of the line. Perhaps the scholiast's gloss has supplanted the transmitted text.$

735 Below this, the final two lines of the fragment do not seem to fit the pattern of 736 and 737. The first of these lines may be read as two uncertain traces, a curved letter; possibly two uprights; in the second there are indeterminate traces from perhaps three letters.

D. HUGHES

A. NODAR

**4550.** EURIPIDES, *MEDEA* 748(?)–52, 1007–9, 1345–6(?)

23 3B.1/Q(1–3)b  
*II*<sup>5c</sup> Diggle  
 M.–P. 405

Fr. 1 2 × 3.4 cm  
 Fr. 2 3.9 × 2.2 cm  
 Fr. 3 7.5 × 6.4 cm

Second century

Three small scraps of papyrus survive, two of which contain remains from the middle of a column, while the third has only five letters from the ends of two lines. Just enough remains of this third fragment to show certain similarities in the script, which confirm the association with the other two fragments. The text is written along the fibres of the roll in a clear, well-rounded, slightly ornate hand of medium size, with a slight rearwards slant, a relatively informal example of the round decorated style illustrated in Norsa, *Scritt. lett.* pl. 9. Some accents and breathings are used, and word-ending and elision are indicated by apostrophe. It is not ascertainable whether or not iota adscript was written. The backs are blank except for ink stains on the back of fr. 3.

The main point of interest in these small scraps is that they may be identified as from the same roll as P. Harris I 38 (*Medea* 719–723, 1046–1053, 1279–1312, 1313–1328 = *II*<sup>5a</sup>) and P. Fitzw. Mus. Add 109 (1156–60, 1165–77 = *II*<sup>5b</sup>). The immediately apparent overall similarity in the hands is supported by the following shared peculiarities: the same apostrophe; the well-defined pen-strokes and high cross-bars of  $\eta$  and  $\theta$ ; as in fr. 3, the extension of the cross-bar of  $\epsilon$  well beyond the main arc of the letter; the distinctive curves of  $\mu$ , with, in some instances, a loop on the first upright stroke of the letter; again, in some cases, a looped middle in  $\omega$ ; the blob of ink on the upper curve of  $\varsigma$ , caused by the addition of a second stroke of the pen to complete the formation of the letter.

The editor of P. Harris 38 (Powell) states that the apostrophe was added by a second hand, and that the first hand employed a rounded circumflex accent (as, we believe, in fr. 2), while the second hand used a peaked circumflex accent, which is not to be seen in the new fragments.

One or two variant readings may be noted, and in particular, the papyrus supports the MSS readings for line 752.



## Fr. 1 (748(?)–752)

. . . . .  
 ] . . [

750 [μητ αυτος εκ γης ση]ς εμ ε[κβαλειν ποτε]  
 [μητ αλλος ην τις τω]ν εμω[ν εχθρων αγειν]  
 [χρηιζηι μεθησειν γ]ης εκουζ[ιωι τροπωι]  
 [ομνυμι Γαιαν λαμ]προν Η[λιου τε φως]

. . . . .

## Fr. 2 (1007–1009)

. . . . .

1007 [κουκ] αςμένη τον[δ εζ εμου δεχηι λογον]  
 [αιαι]

1008 [ταδ ο]ν ξύνωδα' τοιζιν [εξηγγελεμενοις]

1009 [αιαι] μαλ' αὔθις [

. . . . .

## Fr. 3 (1345–6 (?))

. . . . .

[δακοιμι τοιονδ εμπεφυκε σοι θρ]αζος  
 [ερρ αιχροποιε και τεκνων μαιφον]ε  
 foot?

## Fr. 1

748 Four traces of ink are visible, perhaps representing two letters. The first two spots are consistent with the shape of  $\mu$ , while  $\eta$  is possible for the next two traces. This would suggest the following restoration for the line:  $\tau\iota$   $\chi\rho\eta\mu\alpha$   $\delta\rho\alpha\sigma\epsilon\iota\nu$   $\eta$   $\tau\iota$   $\mu\eta$  [ $\delta\rho\alpha\sigma\epsilon\iota\nu$   $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon$ ].

751  $\gamma$ ]ης DAV and Tr: ζών BOC(L)P and V<sup>398</sup>T<sup>198</sup>.

752 Spacing suggests  $\lambda\alpha\mu$ ]προν Η[λιου τε φως] with CALP:  $\lambda\alpha\mu\pi\rho\acute{o}\nu$   $\theta'$   $\acute{\eta}\lambda\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon$   $\acute{\phi}\acute{\alpha}\omicron\varsigma$  BODV ( $\theta'$  om. B):  $\acute{\phi}\acute{\omega}\varsigma$   $\tau\epsilon$   $\lambda\alpha\mu\pi\rho\acute{o}\nu$   $\acute{\eta}\lambda\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon$  Page:  $\acute{\eta}\lambda\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon$   $\theta'$   $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\acute{o}\nu$   $\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\beta\alpha\varsigma$  Porson e  $\Sigma^b$  ad 746. But it is not impossible that the trace of ink after  $\rho\omicron\nu$  may be an apostrophe, i.e.:  $\omicron\mu\upsilon\upsilon\mu\iota$   $\Gamma\alpha\iota\alpha\nu$   $\lambda\alpha\mu$ ]προν [ $\theta'$ ] [ $\acute{\eta}\lambda\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon$   $\acute{\phi}\alpha\omicron\varsigma$  with BODV.

## Fr. 2

1007 If this line is to be excised (Valckenaer), the interpolation is clearly of a quite early date.

[αιαι]. The space between 1007 and 1008 allows sufficient room for  $\alpha\acute{\iota}\alpha\acute{\iota}$ .

1009 The line is divided after Medea and before the Pedagogue; blank papyrus after  $\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\theta\iota\varsigma$  makes it clear that the second half of the line, spoken by the Pedagogue, began a new line with the change of speaker. There is no evidence of punctuation at this point, the double dot for example, to indicate the different speaker. Note that it was the practice of some copies to give the second part of a two-speaker trimeter its own line (so in *Ichneutai* and *Hypsipyle*): see *GMAW*<sup>2</sup> pp. 62, 64.



60 νεο]υς cτηρω [  
 δεσποτ]ων α[ιθηεταιι]  
 βο]υλευε[ται]

46 N]ηρείδο[ς pap.: Nηρηιδος III **451**: Nηρηίδος VLP: Nηρηίδος MAV<sup>3</sup>: Nηρηίδος BOW, printed by Diggle.

50 ] δ ουδεν pap.: τ'ουδέν MBOAVWLP, printed by Diggle.

51 Λοξ[ι]α pap.: Λοξία MBOAVWLP, printed by Diggle.

52 εις pap., MBOAVLP: ἐς Tr., printed by Diggle.

53 τεινει pap., O: κτένει MBVWLΣ<sup>mnv</sup>: τίνει AP γρΣ<sup>mnv</sup>: 'κτίνει B<sup>3</sup>: οδ 'κτίνει Hermann. οδ is transmitted by all witnesses. Diggle argues in his apparatus that it is superfluous, suggesting οί τίνειω.

58 Mark at end after space in darker ink, perhaps intended as marking clause-end?

59] δ pap.: τ' MBOAVWLP.

ην pap., MBOAVWLP: ἦ edd., printed by Diggle.

60 cτηρω pap.: ἦκω MBOAVWLP, printed by Diggle. Only ]υς remains of the word preceding cτηρω, and after cτηρω the line is lost. νεο]υς cτηρω [λογους] does not make sense, and the scribe may well have written something different.

M. OGAWA

#### 4552. EURIPIDES, *ANDROMACHA* 87–91

81 2B.85/10(b)

2.6 × 2.8 cm

Second century

A small scrap from a papyrus roll; width and height of column unknown; intercolumnar space at least 1.3 cm; line-spacing 0.4 cm. The back is blank. The text is written along the fibres in a regular, fluent, rounded book-hand of medium size that slopes a little to the left. The letters are in general slightly taller than broad, with the narrow ι and ρ contrasting with the markedly broad ω. All preserved letters are strictly bilinear (particularly ι, ρ, Υ). Vertical and oblique strokes are usually decorated with left-facing serifs at the top (α, ι, λ, Υ, left vertical of η; not α) and right-facing ones at the bottom (α, ι, λ), which are, however, not added as separate strokes, but written without lifting the pen. The cross-bars of ε and η are slightly raised. The hand shows influence of cursive scripts in the looped α, the looped lower left angle of α (4), in c (upper stroke almost a horizontal forming a right angle with an only slightly curved vertical), and in Υ the vertical of which resembles a small loop; additionally, ε is joined with ι (5). In general, however, the scribe wrote his letters separately.

For the general type, cf. XVIII **2161** (Turner, *GMAW*<sup>2</sup> 24; sim. α, c, ω, but on the whole more formal), XXVI **2441** (ibid. 22; sim. α, ο, γ, c, ω, serifs), the London *Hyperides* (P. Lit. Lond. 132 = Roberts, *GLH* 13b; sim. α, α, ο, ρ, γ, ω, but more informal), all assigned to the second century, and, in particular, XLII **3030** (*GMAW*<sup>2</sup> 87; most probably AD 207; cf. α, λ, ο, γ, serifs, vertical extension). Thus, a date in the second century seems likely.

No accents, breathings, quantity marks or critical signs are in evidence. Change of

speaker is indicated by paragraphoi; a high stop in 1, perhaps added by a second hand. The scribe wrote iota adscript in 1 and elided tacitly in 3.

The text neither yields any new readings nor overlaps or joins with other papyri of the play hitherto known.

87  $\frac{\text{οραις} \cdot \text{απ[ανδαις]} \\ \text{ου δητ[α} \\ \text{αλλ ε[ιμι}} \\ 90 \frac{\text{δουλ[ης]} \\ \text{χωρε[ι}} \\ \cdot \quad \cdot \quad \cdot \quad \cdot$

C. MÜLKE

**4553.** EURIPIDES, *ANDROMACHA* 93–9, 150–1(?)

83/47(b)

4.6 × 4.2 cm

Fourth century?

Fragment with (outer?) edge of codex leaf, written in a now brownish ink. Identification of lines on one side is not certain, so it is not possible to tell front and back with certainty. Hand is a later capital of smallish-medium size, minimum decoration, perhaps lingering severe style shapes (e.g.  $\mathfrak{N}$ , diminutive  $\omega$ ), combined with later forms ( $\kappa$  as in chancery hands). Final  $\mathfrak{N}$  is abbreviated once at line-end by the placement of a supralinear stroke over the preceding vowel. Elision appears to have been effected (98) but probably not marked, and in the same line there may not be space for iota adscript.

(?front)

↓

93  $\frac{\text{εμφεφυ]κε} \text{γαρ} \\ \text{] κακων}} \\ 95 \frac{\text{]}} \\ \text{στεν]ειν} \\ \text{Εκτορ]α} \\ \text{δαιμο]ν ω [ς]νεζυγῆ} \\ \text{αναξιω]ς} \\ \cdot \quad \cdot \quad \cdot \quad \cdot$

95 No trace of line-end, but the line is shorter than 94 and 96.

(?back)

→

	·		·		·		·		·
	[								]
	[								]
	[								]
?150	δ[	ομωv							
?151	αλ[	λ							
	[								]
		·	·	·	·	·	·	·	

150–1(?) δ[ in supposed 150 might be read as α[; conversely, αλ[ in supposed 151 might be read as δ[. Between the two lines there are some specks of ink in the margin, probably accidental.

Among beginnings in the surrounding lines to which these traces might adapt, there are also 124–5 δ[ιδυμων, αv[δρα and 178–9 δ[νοῖv, ἀλ[λ'. But judging from the alignment of the text on the other side (97–8) this would imply a codex page of 26 lines for the former (too short; also middle of chorus and papyrus' colometry uncertain) and 80 for the latter (too long). 150–1 imply a page of 52 lines, which is quite long but conceivable.

D. OBBINK

**4554.** EURIPIDES, *ANDROMACHA* 748–51, 790–2

105/60(a)

10.7 × 6.9 cm

Fifth century?

Top of a codex page written in a now brown ink with generous top margin (4 cm) and line beginnings on one side, line ends on the other. The original scribe penned marks of elision, and the accent on *τάλαινα* (748); other accents and middle stops have been added in a thinner pen and black ink after the initial text was written. Hand is a diminutive version of the Coptic uncial, with minimal decoration: serifs in the form of dots on arms of γ and τ, flat apex once on α, and contrast between thick verticals and thinner horizontals. x shows tail swooping low to left (note that in front 1 what at first glance seems to be a continuation is an accent in the line below, not part of x). Tail of γ similarly angles out to left at bottom. ω comparatively wide, c, e in a narrow compass by contrast. A marginal note of obscure import is written to the right of 791 in a small pale semi-cursive hand.

The colometry of 791–2 differs from Diggle's edition.

?front

↓

                                      
 κύ τ' ω τάλαινα· χείματ[οc γαρ αγριου]  
                                      
 τυχοῦσα· λιμένας ἦλ[θεc ειc ευνημεουc]

750 [ω πρϵς]βυ θ[εοι κο]ι δο[ιεν  
] π[αιδα ]...[

?back

→

790 [ω γερον Αι]ακιδα{ι}  
[πειθομαι και κυ]ν Λαπ[ι]θ[αις]ι ρε Κεϵν [ ] . εϵ[α]ι  
[ταυροις ομιλης]αι δ[ορι κλ]εϵν[οτατω(ι)

D. OBBINK

**4555.** EURIPIDES, *ANDROMACHA* 809–50, 851–91, 1061–96, 1100–37  
(several lines lost)

95/53 (a)

Overall c. 32 × 36 cm

Sixth century

Several fragments belonging to one bifolium from a papyrus codex. Measurements are as follows: the c. 40 lines of each column are around 25 cm high; the maximum preserved upper margin is 4.8 cm and the lower margin is 6 cm. This results in a page c. 36 cm high. As for the breadth, inner margins measure between 1.5 and 2 cm, and the maximum outer margin (in p. 3) is 5 cm. Since an average line is about 12 cm long, the entire page would be around 19 cm broad. These measurements place our codex in Turner's first group; i.e. 'the largest sizes' (*Typology* 14), more specifically in his third subgroup, with 'less broad, still very tall (35 cm. H and more)' codices. Perhaps his codex 459 (*Virgil glossary*, P. Ryl. III 478 + P. Med. 1 + P. Cairo, attributed to the fourth/fifth century), measuring 20 × 35 cm, is the closest to ours in dimensions.

At c. 40 lines per page, the entire play would have occupied 32 pages (i.e. 16 leaves, 8 bifolia). The 808 lines missing before **4555** would have fitted in 10 leaves, and two more would have been needed after **4555** to complete the play. If the quires of the codex consisted of four bifolia, then the play could have fitted in two quires, and the codex itself might have contained just this work. The gap between pages 2 and 3 of **4555** (ll. 892–c. 1055) would correspond to the innermost bifolium of the second quire. If the quire size was larger, then we would have some extra leaves at the end of the *Andromacha*, very probably continuing with another play.

The hand, in a now brown faded ink, is a sloping pointed majuscule of the type represented by PSI II 126 (Menander, *Aspis*), attributed to the first half of the fifth century (*GBEPP* 15b); but it shows features which point to a later date, such as α in a slightly slanting position, some curvature of the strokes, elongated ο, and, above all, the pointed ends of the verticals of κ, ρ, τ, γ, and φ, which descend below the base-line. The conspicuous-

ness of the shading, which shows thicker obliques descending to right and thinner ones ascending to right, and thicker vertical strokes against thinner horizontals, also indicates a later date, as described for XV **1817** (Homer, *Iliad* XVII and XVIII), attributed to the mid-sixth century (*GBEBP* 28a), with which our papyrus compares very well. Cf. also P. Berol. inv. 11754+21187 (Homer, *Odyssey* X; *GBEBP* 39a), assigned to the second half of the sixth century (see in particular the use of ornamental roundels at the end of strokes). I should be inclined to propose the sixth century as the probable date for our papyrus.

Lectional signs are used profusely: acute, grave and circumflex accents, a diaeresis, apostrophes, smooth breathings, a sign for crasis and paragraphoi to mark change of speaker are present in the text. They seem to be due to the same hand as that responsible for the main text, although in some cases they appear to be written in a lighter ink, which might indicate that some of the lectional signs were added in a second reading of the text by the same scribe. The same can be said of the abbreviations of characters' names (that at 1070 in a paler ink could be thought to be due to a different hand, by reason of the different shape of  $\alpha$ , but see, for instance,  $\alpha$  in 851 for a more rounded version of the letter), and the superscript corrections at 814 and, probably, 825. Most, but not all words carry accents. Elision is consistently effected and seems to have been consistently marked, although apostrophes are not always visible in the places where they would be expected, mainly due to the damaged condition of the surface, as in 1107 and 1108. For similar reasons, one would suspect, iota adscript is not visible at 883, while it is consistently written elsewhere in the text.

1061–2 overlap with P. Berol. inv. 17021 and 1082–96, 1101–2, 1113–33 with P. De Langhe; 1133–7 overlap with P. Berol. inv. 13418 (*II*<sup>7</sup>). Very possibly, a new variant at 1068.

Page 1

→

		εκ τῶνδ' α[τιμωσ
810		η κατ[θ]άνη[ι μόλ[ις] δέ [ εἶργ[ουσι ξίφη κ[αθ]α[ρπαζουσιν ουτω με[[.]] τ' α[λγει
815		έγνωκε πρ... [ [δ]ε[ποι]ναν έ[ι]ργον[ς υ[μεις] δ[ε] βασαι τ[ωνδε θαν[ά]του νιν εκ[λυσαθε φ[ιλων] νεοι μολον[τες
820	$\frac{\text{X}}{\rho}$	και μὴν εν [ο]ικο[ις [βο]ήν εφ' οἴκω [ δε[ι]ξε[ι]ν δ' ε[οικεν





]ῆ τóτ[ε]  
]..[

(c. 4 lines missing)

]..[  
].....  
860? ]...[ ].  
]vac.  
]vac.  
864 επερ]αεξ[ν] ακτ[α]ς  
]..  
επηι]νεσα  
εξε]μαρτ[α]νεξ  
δει]μα[ινεισ  
]πόξ[ις

(10 lines missing)

880 ].[  
].α.[  
τυρ]αννι[και ].[  
]ῆ τίς ω[ν ].[  
Κλυτ]αιμ[νηστρ]α[ς το]κος  
885 ερχομ]αι δε πρ[ος Δι]ος  
επ]εὶ δ' αφι[κ]ο[μ]ην  
ξυγγ]ενοῦς μ[α]θε[ι]ν πε[ρι]  
κε]ντυχοῦς[α τυγ]χαν[ει]  
].[].[ ]..[  
890 ]εστ[ιν] φίλη.  
λι]μῆ[ν φα]νείς

851 Remains of ink to the right of ο; they do not seem to be compatible with ι (θεήλατοι MSS) unless the letter has been abraded almost entirely; further to the right there are more remains, belonging to a line-filler?

883 ]ῆ τίς ω[ν: πυνθάνη τίς ὦν V<sup>3</sup>: τίς ὦν πυνθάνη MBOAVLP.

884 Κλυτ]αιμ[νηστρ]α[ς HMBQAVLP: Κλυταιμήστρας Wecklein.

το]κος HMAVLP: γόνος BO.

888 ]ντυχοῦς[. Γ or Ν seems to have been written above τ; Γ? above χ.

891 Dot below ε, to the right, for alignment?



Αγαμέμνονος  
 ποίαν περαίνων ἐλ[πιδ  
 και σου γε παιδὸς] πα[ιδι  
 κρυπτός καταστὰς ἢ κ[ατ  
 1065 ἀγν[οι]ς ἐν ἱερ[ο]ῖς Ἀ[ο]ξίου [Δελ]φῶν [  
 οἴμοι τοδ' ἦδη δ[ε]ινὸν. οὐχ [ο]σο[ν τ]αχ[ος]  
 χωρήσεται τ[ις] Πυ[θ]ι[κ]ῆν πρὸς [ε]στ[ι]αν  
 και τὰ[νθ]ά[δ] ο[ντα το]ῖς [ε]κεῖ φράσει φιλ[οις]  
 πρὶν[ ] . . . ἀνεῖν ἐχθ[ρῶν]  
 1070 Α[γ] ἰω μ[οι] . [

(16 lines missing)

θέαι δ[ιδοντες  
 και τ[ουθ  
 κύκλ[οις  
 1090 Αγαμέμνονος  
 ἐ[ς οὐς ἐ]κά[στῳι ] . . .  
 ] τοῦτ[ον ] ωαψ.[  
 [χρυ]σοῦ γεμ[οντα θησα]υρ[οις] βροτ[ῶν]  
 δ]έντερον παρ[ονθ εφ οι]ςι και πάρος  
 1095 [δε]υρ' ἦλθε Φόιβο[ν ναον εκ]πέσαι θέλω[ν]  
 [κα]κ του . . [ ] . [ ] ον ἐν πόλει κακ[ον]

1063 σου HMODAVLP: *cōi* Lobeck. πα[ιδι]: π seems to be a correction from another (triangular?) letter.

1066 The remains transcribed as a low stop are not very clear, but cf. 890, 1103 and 1108.

1067 πρὸς [ε]στ[ι]αν HMODLP: ἀνὰ χθόνα AV (~V<sup>398</sup>).

1068 φράσει: λέξει MSS.

1070 ἰω μ[οι] LP and V<sup>2</sup>: ᾗμοι HMODAV. Below ω, trace of an acute accent from the line below.

1087–91 Reconstruction of the text as preserved here has been difficult.

1087 θέαι. Remains of ink above α, to the right.

1091 ] . . . Read ]οις at line-end? But traces could be compatible with almost any other characters.



1100 ] . . . [

]πω πεπυςμένοι  
 ]τ' εφέσταμεν  
 μαντε]σίν τε Πυθικο[ι]ς·  
 ε]ιπ[εν ω νε]ανία τι κοι  
 1105 κατευ]ξω[μει]ςθα τινος ήκεις χάριν  
 Φοι]βωι της πάρο[ιθ] αμαρτίας  
 παρ]αρχειν βουλο[μει]ςθ ηιτια[  
 π]οτ αυτον αιμα[τος δι]κην.  
 ] Ορέστου[ ]..[  
 1110 ].[

(17 lines missing)

] π[ε]τρο[ι]ς.  
 1130 σποδ]ορύμενος  
 εμβο]λάς.  
 [ε]κ[εισε ]..[  
 [α]λλ' ου[δεν ομ]ου [   
 οϊςτοῖ [ αμ]φώβο[λοι  
 [σφ]αγής [εχωρουν βουποροι πο]δών πα[ρος]  
 1135 [δει]να[ς δ αν] είδε[ς πυρριχας] φρουρουμει[νου  
 [βελ]εμνα παιδος ω[ς δε ..]ν περ[ι]ςταδον  
 [κυ]κλωι κατείχον ου [ ]..[ ]..πγοός

1100 Minimal traces above belonging to previous line.

1103 τε. There is some accidental (?) ink below vertical of τ. Πυθικο[ι]ς MODL and P<sup>2</sup>: πυθικῆς AV(P?). The stop at line-end seems to be medial rather than low as the others in the text.1105 κατευ]ξω[μει]ςθα: κατευξώμε(ς)θα MODP: -όμε(ς)θα AVL and Σ<sup>v</sup>.

1128 The ink at line-end, which I have interpreted as a stop, could also be accidental. Above this line, in right margin, (m. 2) ] . ρ . υ[.

1130 Accidental spot at the end of the line?

1134 [σφ]αγής Π<sup>7</sup>MOP and <sup>1</sup>Σ<sup>m</sup> and <sup>1</sup>Σ<sup>v</sup>: σφαγείς AVL and <sup>1</sup>Σ<sup>v</sup>.1136 παιδος Π<sup>7</sup>AVP: ποδός MOL.]γ: νω Π<sup>7</sup>L and V<sup>3</sup>: μων MOAVP.1137 ] . πγοός: ]απγοός perhaps, as from ἀναπνοάς (Π<sup>7</sup>)L, but ]μπγοός, from ἀμπνοάς in UMODAVP, would also be possible.

A. NODAR



ad loc.) notes that 608 recalls Thuc. iii 82, and that *κρείσσων πυρός* may be a reminiscence of Soph. *OT* 177, and *ναυτική τ' ἀναρχία* of *IA* 914. Aristotle calls the populace of the Piraeus *ναυτικός ὄχλος* (F. W. King, *Euripides' Hecuba*, London 1938, ad loc.). In defence of the lines' genuineness, however, it may be said that Hecuba elsewhere in this play declaims against the democracy in similar fashion (254–5 on demagogues, with Σ ad loc.). Eur. fr. 243.2 *μυρίους στρατεύματος* looks suspiciously similar, and might corroborate the Euripidean provenance of *στρατεύματι* in 606.

D. OBBINK

**4557.** EURIPIDES, *HECUBA* 651–69, 710–38, 742–73 (desunt 756–9)

26 3B.48/C(1–2)a  
Π<sup>7</sup> Diggle  
M.–P. 388.4

12 × 24.3 cm

Second century

This tattered fragment contains parts of two columns from a papyrus roll. The first column extends from line 651 to 669 and the second from 710 to 773. At the foot of col. ii in the bottom margin, the same hand has copied line 762, which has been omitted from the main body of the text. In the same column, following line 738, the papyrus is broken and three lines have been lost, while lines 756–9 have been purposely omitted. This omission will be treated in a fuller discussion below. Allowing for uncertainties about omitted lines, and perhaps added lines, each column would seem to have contained c. 55 lines. The reconstructed second column has a height of about 21 cm. A little under 2.5 cm of blank papyrus forms the top margin, and the space between the columns is just under 2 cm at its narrowest point. On the back and across the fibres are traces of some documentary writing.

The text is written along the horizontal fibres of the roll in an extremely small hand, of a size more usually found in ancient commentaries than in pure literary texts. A similar hand is to be found in XXXII **2637**, a commentary on choral lyric, assigned to the middle of the second century. XXX **2516**, particularly small (a text of Antimachus) and the tiny, ornamental hand of XXXI **2535** (hypomnema) may also be cited. That in XXVIII **2483** (Hesiod, *Catalogue*) is similar in certain respects to the hand in the new Hecuba fragment, but is somewhat larger.

The text of the fragment is both carefully written and thoughtfully spaced out. The scribe appears to have striven to attain an almost perfect symmetry within the columns of writing. At the start of col. ii, the beginnings of lines 710 to 711 and 716 to 721 are inset further from the margin than those of the longer, trimeter lines. As far as can be judged, the same thing occurs with the ends of lines 651 to 652, in col. i. At line 710 the marginal abbreviation of the speaker of the line is correspondingly inset. Another point to be noted is the uneven spacing of the letters in lines 658 to 661. This may be an attempt to give the lines a uniform length and so render their arrangement as nearly symmetrical as possible. To consider it an indication of word division would make nonsense of the Greek.

Of the individual letters, the following may be said: ε is in most cases peculiarly large, particularly at the top of col. ii, where the first example of the letter is at least twice the size

of other letters; the vertical of κ extends upwards, well above the level of the other letters, while that of ρ descends equally below the line; in some examples of η, the cross-stroke, connecting the two verticals, is almost horizontal, leaving little difference between η and η; the second vertical of π is decidedly crescent-shaped; letters with cross-bars, especially ε, ρ, c, and τ, tend to touch the following letter in many instances.

Both *scriptio plena* and elision occur; the latter is indicated by apostrophe at lines 714 and 771. Iota adscript is not employed. Change of speaker is clearly shown by both paragraphus and marginal abbreviation of the character's name. Besides this, there remains no evidence of further punctuation or breathings and accentuation.

Many of the fibres have stripped off, while those which remain are frequently badly rubbed. The papyrus overlaps at 710–22 with **4558**; 737–8 overlap with VI **876**; 744, 749, 751, 769–73 with **4559**; 768 and 772 with **4560**. In spite of the relatively poor state of preservation of the papyrus, there are several interesting readings. For line 665 it agrees with M A L; for lines 714 and 716 with all but A; for line 718 the papyrus corresponds with A L B; in line 729 it agrees with all the manuscripts, as in 735, but for a variant recorded in B; finally, the papyrus is in agreement with M and B at line 747. On the evidence of these readings, the new papyrus seems to be most closely akin to M, of the twelfth century, and generally accepted as the superior manuscript of the medieval period. However, if the differences and omissions are taken into account, it is clear that the agreement of the papyrus and M is purely relative, and no definite connection between the two may be safely established.

Of special interest is the omission of lines 756–9, see now also **4558** and cf. **4559**. It is certainly interesting that in M and B lines 756–8 are omitted, although added by a second hand in B (see apparatus for more detail). The new arrangement of lines 752–762, as in the papyrus, is worth considering in some detail. The division of the lines between Hecuba and Agamemnon is quite symmetrical, as follows: 752–3 (Hecuba), 754–5 (Agamemnon), 760 (Hecuba), 761 (Agamemnon), 762 (added in lower margin: Hecuba), etc. The arrangement found in M and B, with the exception of line 759, is similar: 752–3 (Hecuba), 754–5 (Agamemnon), 759–60 (Hecuba), 761 (Agamemnon), 762 (Hecuba), etc. The four lines omitted in the papyrus:

*οὐ δῆτα· τοὺς κακοὺς δὲ τιμωρομένη  
αἰῶνα τὸν σύμπαντα δουλεύειν θέλω.  
καὶ δὴ τίν' ἡμᾶς εἰς ἐπάρκειν καλεῖς;  
οὐδέν τι τούτων ὦν εὐδοξάζεις, ἄναξ.*

add nothing to the sense of the passage; indeed, in their absence, the verbal exchange between Hecuba and Agamemnon is more pointed and phrased with greater succinctness. In essence, the omission covers, in 756–7, Hecuba's direct answer to Agamemnon's question in 754–5; in 758, Agamemnon's rather lame repetition of his question; in 759, Hecuba's reiteration, differently phrased, of what she said in 756–7, that she did not seek her freedom from slavery. The authenticity of the four lines has been questioned by editors, and 759 is deleted by Hartung as an interpolation, while doubts have been expressed by Nauck on







- 765 [η γαρ τιν αλ]λογ ετ[εκες η κεινους γυναι]  
 [ανονητα] γ ως εο[ικε τονδ ον ειςορας]  
 [που δ ων] ετυγχαγ [ηνικ ωλλυ]το [πτολις]  
 [πατηρ νιν] εξεπεμψεν ορρωδων [θανειν]  
 [ποι των τοτ] οντων χωρισας [τεκνων μονον]  
 770 [εσ τηνδε χ]ωραν ο[v]περ ευρ[ε]θ[η θανων]  
 [προς ανδ]ρ' ος αρχει τηςδ[ε] Π[ολυμ]ηστωρ χθονος]  
 [ενταυθ επεμ]φ[θ]η πικροτα[τ]ο[υ] χρυ[σου φυλαξ]  
 [θνησκει δε προς τ]ου και τινος π[ο]τμου τυχων]

The marginal line:

- 762 [τουτον ποτ ετεκο]ν και εφερον ζω[νης υπο]

Col. i

655 δρυπτε[τα]ι παρ[ξ]ιαν] MBOLRSaZZcT<sup>1</sup>: δρύπτεται τε AFGKPPaξZm and Zc<sup>1c</sup>: δέ V. However, the papyrus traces are so indeterminate that τε/δέ could easily fit in. Diggle adopts τε and posits a lacuna after it 'quoniam τε, quamquam numeros corruptit, vix abesse potest; suppleueris e.g. τ' (ἀθλίαν) vel τε (δίπτυχον)'.

656 σπαραγμοίς is absent; σπαραγμοίς is best explained as a gloss, taken over from the scholia, which read: δρύπτεται δὲ παρειάν· οἶονεὶ ξαίνει τὴν ἐαυτῆς παρειάν τιθεμένη ἐν τοῖς σπαραγμοῖς ὄνυχα δίαμιον.

658 There is no other authority for ποί. ποῦ ποθ' is frequently used in tragedy in questions of this type, and is to be preferred. Unexplained traces above end of line.

662 μοι Herwerden: cou codd.

663 γάρ: δέ MSS.

665 [v]περ Ω and X<sup>m</sup> Z<sup>γν</sup> Zc<sup>m</sup> Zm<sup>c</sup>: ὕπο Zm and B<sup>3</sup> and Zb: ἄπο FPPaSaVξZZcT<sup>1</sup> and B<sup>3γρ</sup>O<sup>1c</sup>A<sup>2</sup>.

Col. ii

709 εμ[ο]ς εμος: just once in OPaSaξZ.

713 οἶμοι: ὄμοι Pξ. λέγεις: λέγεις L (~L<sup>2</sup>) and A<sup>3</sup> F<sup>3</sup> K<sup>3</sup> Pa<sup>3</sup> ξ<sup>3</sup>.

714 In this line elision is marked. This only occurs elsewhere in the fragment in 771, although syllables are frequently elided, as in 724, 727. In many places where the strictures of space make it clear that elision of syllables took place, the papyrus is too badly damaged to tell whether or not the apostrophe was used to mark elision. In other instances, *scriptio plena* is to be found, as for example in line 715, and again in line 727, where it is seen alongside an example of elision.

In ἀωνόμαστα the papyrus has the orthographically correct form of the word, and not the unmetrical ἀνονόμαστα AG.

715 [οι]α (*scriptio plena* in pap.): δα M (~M<sup>3</sup>): δία τ' GK: δία γ' Z and T<sup>1</sup>.

716 ω ΩξζT<sup>1</sup>: ὦ A and T<sup>2</sup> and Σ<sup>1</sup>.

718 κιδαρφεω(ι) BOAKPaSaξζT<sup>2</sup> and L<sup>2</sup>; the Doric form κιδαρῶ preferable to κιδηρέω Ω and Zm<sup>8</sup> in Hecuba's laments.

720 οἰκ[ι]: ὠικτίας ΩξζT<sup>2</sup>: ὠικτίω PaRξ and M<sup>c</sup>F<sup>8</sup>T<sup>1</sup>: οἰκτίω M: ἐποικτίω fere GK and Sa<sup>γρ</sup>.

724 τουδ[ε]: του PaZm (~ Pa<sup>c</sup>Zm<sup>1c</sup>): τουτο Va: του γε Va<sup>8</sup>.

729 εωμ[εν] is suggested by space, in accord with MSS: εἰώμεν Nauck. Traces and spacing suggest ο[υ]δ[ε] [εφ]ι [αυ]ομ[εν] but do not decide the articulation: οὐδὲ ψάβομεν Ω: οὐδ' ἔψάβομεν Bothe. It probably did not read οὐδὲ θάβομεν with Sa<sup>γρ</sup>.

743 ου]τοι: οὔτι R and Zm<sup>1c</sup>.

745 γϵ: τϵ Va: om. R.

747 τ[o]ι MBOPaξT<sup>z</sup> and Va<sup>1c</sup>Zm<sup>1c</sup>: τι Ωζ (unmetrical). Again the better of the two readings is attested by the papyrus.

756–9 See introduction. 756–9 om. **4557**, **4558** and probably **4559**: MBOFGKRT<sup>z</sup> omit 756–8 and have 759 (but B<sup>2m</sup> F<sup>2m</sup> G<sup>m</sup> K<sup>m</sup>T<sup>m</sup> have added 756–8 and F has them after 779): RfRw omit 756–7 and have 758–9 (but Rf<sup>r</sup> adds 756–7, and Rw<sup>m</sup> 756): ALPPaSaVaξζ present 756–9. Nauck deleted 756–8; Hartung, 759: Diggle deleted 756–7 and printed 759–8 in this order (Hirzel had already used that order, suggesting a lacuna after 757).

761 μαθῆν MFALPPaξζT<sup>z</sup> and O<sup>γρ</sup>: φράσαι Ω and Z<sup>γρ</sup>ZM<sup>γρ</sup>.

762 και ἐφερον: κᾶφερον MSS.

764 υ]π· ἐν O<sup>Sa</sup> and F<sup>2</sup>Xa<sup>s</sup> and Xb<sup>s</sup>.

770 ευρ[ε]θ[η] ηύροθῆ MSS. In Attic inscriptions, the augmented form is normal in the Classical period, exceptional from the 1st century BC (Threatte II 483). In Roman documents ευ- is the norm (Gignac II 240).

D. HUGHES

A. NODAR

**4558.** EURIPIDES, *HECUBA* 709–22, 746–61 (desunt 756–9), 782–94, 816–27

65 6B.37/D(1–3)b

9 × 10.5 cm

Late sixth century

A fragment possibly from the upper half of a bifolium from a papyrus codex. On each side only line-ends to the left and line-beginnings to the right are preserved. The space across the spine is approximately 3 cm. If the fragment comes from the top of the bifolium, then on → the right-hand column will have had 708–44 (32 lines as set out in Diggle's OCT); on ↓, the left-hand column will have had 745–81 (om. 756–9) = 33 lines, the right-hand column 782–815 = 34 lines. 816 ff. form the left-hand column on →. The four columns are consecutive and constitute the inner bifolium of the quire, laid with vertical fibres uppermost, one column to each page. General conclusions about column height and codex dimensions are still valid even if the piece belongs lower down the sheet. The c. 33 lines per column would have resulted in a height of approximately 21 cm, the page being about 25 cm high if we allow for upper and lower margins of 2 cm. Considering that ↓ col. ii—the best preserved one in the papyrus—has only about a sixth of the line length in 791–4, measuring about 2 cm, then the full line-length should be c. 12 cm. Adding 3 cm to allow for both the inner and outer margin, we would have a page breadth of c. 15 cm. These measurements, c. 15 × 25 cm, would place our codex in Turner's group 7 (*Typology* 18) where there are a few other instances from the fifth and sixth centuries.

The hand is representative of the sloping pointed majuscule, showing features suggesting a date later than that proposed for **4555**. The arms of κ are detached from the vertical, ο is very narrow (cf. P. Ant. III 157 and XV **1818**, nos. 23a and 23b respectively in *GBEBP*). This hand compares with that in P. Cair. Masp. 67175 (no. 33b in *GBEBP*), assigned to the middle or second half of the sixth century. However, our hand, whilst not entirely lacking any kind of ornament (cf. long flourish on upper stroke of c in 746), is less formal and less careful in its execution; cf. the almost cursive π, in one movement, in 818. It is very similar to the hand of XI **1374** (42b in *GBEBP*), assigned to the late sixth century; lines there, as

here, slant upwards, which affects the impression of bilinearity. Narrow  $\epsilon$  and minimal shading are shared features of both papyri, suggesting the late sixth century (see *GBEBP* p. 92) as a probable date for **4558**.

No punctuation or reading marks, except for paragraphoi marking change of speaker, diaeresis in 711 and a double point at the end of 753. Abbreviations of the names of characters have been written to the left of the column in, apparently, a different hand, or at least a paler ink different from the faded brown ink used for the main text and the paragraphoi. Elision has been effected, but not marked, in 787. Due to the very bad condition of the papyrus surface, we cannot know precisely what the situation was in lines 818 (where, however, elision seems to have been effected) and 819. No possible cases for iota adscript to be written. A superscript correction seems to be present in 818.

The papyrus overlaps at 710–22 with **4557**; at 747–8, 750–1 it overlaps with **4559**. The papyrus supports the hitherto unique variant of  $\Pi^7$  (**4557**) in excluding 756–9, cf. **4559**.

→

Page 1

top?

710  $\Theta\epsilon\bar{\rho}$   $\tau[\iota\epsilon$   
 $E\kappa\alpha\beta$   $\epsilon[\mu\omicron\varsigma$   
 $\bar{i}\nu$  [  
 $[X]\bar{\sigma}$   $\omicron\iota[\mu\omicron\iota$   
 $E\kappa\alpha\beta$   $\alpha\rho[\rho\eta\tau$   
715  $\omicron\upsilon\chi\omicron[\epsilon\iota$   
 $[\$   
 $.\$  [  
 $.\$  [  
721  $X^{\circ}$   $\omega \tau\lambda[\eta\mu\omicron\nu$   
 $\delta\alpha\iota[\mu\omega\nu$   
 $\cdot \quad \cdot \quad \cdot \quad \cdot$

↓

Page 2

top?

746  $\delta\upsilon\varsigma\mu\epsilon\nu]\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  ]  
 $\epsilon\iota\delta\epsilon\nu]\alpha\iota$   
 $\kappa\lambda\nu]\epsilon\iota\nu$

Page 3

top?

$E\kappa\alpha\bar{\beta}$   $\theta[αλα]ζ\sigma\omicron[\pi\lambdaαγκ\tau\omicron\nu$   
 $A\gamma\alpha^{\mu}$   $\omega [c]\chi\epsilon\tau\lambda[\iota\alpha$   
 $E\kappa\alpha\beta$   $\omicron\lambda\omega\lambda\alpha \kappa\alpha\iota$  [  
785  $A\gamma\alpha^{\mu}$   $\phi\epsilon\nu \phi\epsilon[\nu$

	ατ[ε]ρ	Εκαβ	ουκ ες[τιν
750 <sup>2</sup>	] . .		αλλ ω[νπερ
	]τυχω		ακου[σον
	γουν]ατων		ετε[ργοιμ
	ευδαιμ]ονος:	790	τ[ιμωρος
	ελευθε]ρον		ο[ς ο]υτε [
755	ς]οι		δεικα[ς
760	δ]ακρυ		κοινη[ς
761	μα]θε[ιν]		ξεινι[ας

→  
Page 4

	top?
	] μονη[ν]
	επουδα]ζομ[εν]
	]ιν η ` ποτε
819	τυχαν]εν δ αμα
	(two lines lost)
	οιχο]μαι
	(one line lost)
	το]δε
825	ειρης]εται
	κοιμι]ζετ]αι
	Φ]ρ[υγ]εσ

Page 1

708 Our papyrus attributes the line to the *θεράπαινα*, supporting ΩXXbζT<sup>2</sup> and V<sup>2</sup>: χο. AFGRSVXa.

713 οι]μοι: ᾠμοι Pξ.

714–5 Sa and T<sup>1</sup> attribute these lines to the chorus.

722 Unexplained marginal mark.

Page 2

756–9 **4557** omits 756–9, and spacing suggests that **4559** omitted them too: MBOFGKRT<sup>2</sup> omit 756–8 and have 759 (but B<sup>2m</sup>F<sup>2m</sup>G<sup>m</sup>K<sup>m</sup>T<sup>m</sup> have added 756–8 and F has them after 779): RfRw omit 756–7 and have 758–9 (but Rf<sup>r</sup> adds 756–7, and Rw<sup>m</sup>756): ALPPaSaVaξξ present 756–9. Nauck deleted 756–8; Hartung, 759; Diggle deleted 756–7 and edited 759–8 in this order (Hirzel had already used that order, suggesting a lacuna after 757).

761 μα]θε[ιν] MFALPPajzT<sup>2</sup> and O<sup>vp</sup>: φράσαι Ω and Z<sup>vp</sup>ZM<sup>vp</sup>.

## Page 3

784 καὶ [: κοῦδὲν codd.

793 Nauck deleted 793–7 (Matthiae had already deleted 794–5, and Dindorf 794–7).

## Page 4

818 η´: The surface is very badly damaged; η itself is dubious, and nothing can be said with certainty about the superscript letter. ῆι Ωξξ and M<sup>3</sup>B<sup>2</sup>T: εἴ PaVaT<sup>z</sup> and gV: MB do not preserve a clear reading: ῆν Elmsley.

819 τυγαυ]εἰν with the majority of MSS against τυγαυη O and gV.

δ: θ' codd.

A. NODAR

**4559. EURIPIDES, HECUBA 739–51, 768–87**

18 2B.66/F(2–3)b

9 × 26 cm

Fourth century

P<sup>8</sup> Diggle

M.–P. 389.1

A single column from a papyrus roll written along the fibres in a formal book hand. The back is blank. 739–73 have been written further to the right than 774–87, perhaps displaced to the right by the ends of the choral lines at 681–704, assuming that these stood opposite in the preceding column and perhaps in a different colometry from the medieval MSS.

The hand is a later mixed ('Severe Style') type with an inclination to the right, enhanced shading, and some decoration (hook on apex of λ, Δ, λ, decorative finials on top of left upright of μ, ν, and arms of γ). Diminutive ο, as in the 'Severe Style', but enlarged ς, of the Biblical Uncial variety, i.e. wider than the oval bowl of the narrower ε; compressed φ with pointed sides. A parallel is provided by XI **1358**, Hesiod, *Catalogue* (= Cavallo–Maehler, *GBEP* 1b, early iv, assigned on the basis of third-century accounts on the recto).

Elision is clearly effected and marked with apostrophe in 779 *προνουc*' (probably by the same scribe, but squeezed in later), the only place where we would have expected it except for 741 and 748 where the scribe definitely elided, but I cannot tell if he marked it. There is no opportunity to observe whether iota adscript was written.

Bottom margin is preserved. If the narrow strip of blank papyrus at top shows a top margin (rather than simply abrasion), the columns contained about 48 lines. At this rate the play would have run to some thirty columns, of which this would have been about the fourteenth. Column height 22.5 cm, with trimeters running to about 10 cm. Preserved bottom margin at least 2 cm. Few reading marks, no accents. No preserved speaker or section divisions.

The text is generally eclectic and unremarkable, but virtually error-free, and it gives ancient attestation for a good variant in 740, adopted by Diggle, and probably it omitted 756–9 as do **4557–8**. The papyrus overlaps at 739–40 with VI **876**; at 742–51 it overlaps with **4557**; at 746–51, 782–7 it overlaps with **4558**; and at 768–84 it overlaps with **4560**.

- [τι μοι προσωπωι νωτον εγκλινασα] κον  
 740 [δυρηι το πραχθεν δ ου λε]γεις [τις εσθ] οδε  
 [αλλ ει με δουλην πολεμ]ιαν θ η[γο]υμενο[ς]  
 [γονατων απωσαιτ α]λγοσ αν προσθειμ[εθ αν]  
 [ουτοι πεφυκα μαντι]ς ω[ςτε] μη κλυω[ν]  
 [εξιτορησαι των οδο]ν βου[λευματ]ων  
 745 [αρ εκλογιζομαι γε προς το] δ[ν]εμεις  
 [μαλλον φρενας τουδ οντ]ος ουχι δυσμεν[ους]  
 [ει τοι με βουληι τωνδ]ε [μη]δεν ει[δε]να[ι]  
 [εσ ταυτον ηκεισ και] χα[ρ ο]υδ εγω κλυε[ιν]  
 [ουκ αν δυναιμην του]δε τιμωρειν [ατερ]  
 750 [τεκνοιει τοις εμοιει τι στρ]εφ[ω] ταδε  
 [τολμαν αναγκη καν τ]υχ[ω] καν μη τυ[χων]  
 (752–5 missing)  
 (756–9 omitted)
- 760 δ]ακρ[ν]  
 (761–6 missing)
- ] . . . [
- 768 [πατηρ νιν εξεπεμψεν ορρω]δων [θανειν]  
 [ποι των τοτ οντων χωρις]ασ πα[ιδων μονον]  
 770 [εσ τηνδε χωραν ουπερ ηυρεθ]η θαν[ων]  
 [προς ανδρ οσ αρχει τηςδε Πο]λυμη[ς] τ[ω]ρ χ[θονος]  
 [ενταυθ επεμφθη πικροτατου χ]ρυσου φυλα[ξ]  
 [θνησκει δε προς του και τινο]ς ποτμου τυ[χων]  
 [τινος γ υπ αλλου Θρηξ] νιν [ωλεσε ξενο]ς  
 775 [ω τλημον η που χρ]υσο[ν] ηρα[ςθη λα]βειν  
 [τοιαυτ επειδη συμφορ]αν γω . [
 [ηυρες δε που νιν η] τις ηνεγκεν νεκρον  
 [ηδ εντυχουσα πο]γτιας ακτης επι  
 [τουτον ματευους] η πονους' αλλον [πο]ρον  
 780 [λουτρ ωιχετ οικους εξ] αλος Πολυξενη[
 [κτανων νιν ως εοι]κεν εκβαλλει ξε[νος]  
 [θαλασσοπλαγκτον γ] ωδε διατεμων [χρο]α

[ω χετλια κυ των α]μετρητων πονων  
 [ολωλα κουδεν λοιπ]ον Αγαμεμνον κακ.[.]  
 785 [φευ φευ τις ουτω δυσ]τυχησ εφν γυνη  
 [ουκ εστιν ει μη την] Τυχην αυτην λεγο[ις]  
 [αλλ ωνπερ ουνεκ] αμφι ς[ον] πιπτω γοϋ[υ]

740 παραθεν ΩξζΤ<sup>2</sup>B<sup>3</sup>: κρανθέν ΓγρK<sup>c</sup>: κραθέν Π<sup>1</sup>BK. παραθέν is printed by Diggle, citing D. Bain, *Actors and Audience* 14 n. 1.

742 προσθειμ[ pap., ΩξΖΖcΤ<sup>2</sup>Zm<sup>c</sup>: -θώ- G: -θεί- Va: -θημ- Sa.

752–9 Spacing shows that no more than four of these lines can have been present in the papyrus' text. Presumably 756–9 were omitted as in **4557–8**, corroborating the suspicion that these lines were in fact absent in at least one branch of the ancient tradition. In the medieval tradition, 756–9 are present in ALPPaSaVaξξ. But MBOFGKRT<sup>z</sup> omit 756–8 (which are added in some of these), while RfRw omit 756–7. Problems with these lines have long been suspected. Diggle deletes 756–7 as spurious, keeping 758–9 as authentic but printing them in reverse order. Nauck deleted 756–8, Hartung 759.

760 δ]ακρ[υ]: on a fragile twisted piece connecting the upper and lower halves of the fragmentary column.

761–7 Scattered specks only.

769 πα[ιδων pap., GKR: τέκνων Ω, printed by Diggle.

771 Πο]λυμη[ς]τ[ω]ρ pap., ΩXXvZT<sup>2</sup>: -τορα FLPaRSVaXaZcZmB<sup>3</sup>Z<sup>2</sup>.

774 At this point the lines shift unexpectedly to the left, in the middle of Hecuba's and Agamemnon's stichomythia. Since this *ekthesis* cannot mark a structural division or metrical shift in the play, I suppose rather that 739–73 above were written in *eisthesis* to accommodate the layout of the preceding column. But why did the scribe not move out to the left earlier, immediately after the choral lines give way to trimeters in the previous column?

776 After -ρ]αν the papyrus offers an upright to the far right in a wide letter space, as of ς, then apparently ρω, where we would expect εγνω before Φρυγών. The trace following ρω could be the lower left quadrant of a circle, compatible with φ. A hypothesis is that the scribe transposed γ and υ, writing -ρ]αν [ε]υγω Φ[ρυγων], although the space for [ε] would be very tight.

778 ακησ pap., Ω, printed by Diggle: ἀκτις OZ<sup>γρ</sup>: ἀλδς LPZ.

784 The papyrus offers no way of deciding at line end, where the tradition is divided between κακῶν (ΩξΖcZmT<sup>2</sup>A<sup>1c</sup>K<sup>1c</sup>Z<sup>1c</sup>, printed by Diggle) and κακόν (AKLZξ<sup>8</sup>Zm<sup>8</sup>T<sup>1</sup>).

785 εφν pap., ΩM<sup>1c</sup>K<sup>1c</sup>L<sup>c</sup>, printed by Diggle: εφη MAL.

786 λεγο[ις] pap., MBAGLRK<sup>c</sup>, printed by Diggle: λέγεις ΩξζΤ<sup>2</sup>L<sup>1c</sup> Eust. in Il. p. 651.29: λέγεις Va<sup>8</sup>.

D. OBBINK

#### 4560. EURIPIDES, *HECUBA* 765–84

48 5B.26/G(a)

6 × 11 cm

Late second/third century

Π<sup>9</sup> Diggle

M.–P. 389.2

This fragment from a roll preserves the ends of twenty lines and a minimum 2 cm of the intercolumnium. It is possible that line 765 is the top line of the column. The text is written along the fibres. Column width could be c. 12 cm. The hand belongs to the Severe Style, especially μ and flat-bottomed ω; there is some shading, especially in υ, γ, κ, and π. There are some ligatures (γυ in 765, γω in 776) and also some variations in the execution of

the letters (see ε, γ, ο; ο tends to be written fairly fast and its execution ranges from oval and quick to a round and careful form). However, the scribe writes the capitals most of the time separately and carefully: μ is in three strokes, deep and rounded; ξ is of book-hand type, while τ is in two strokes with a continuous upper stroke. ω has a very shallow bowl. There is a mixture of narrow letters (ε θ ο c) and broad letters (α κ μ ν π). Furthermore, a combination of round or oval curves (μ ω ν θ ο and occasionally c and ε) with pointed angles (α κ) can be observed. Similar hands are Turner, *GMAW*<sup>2</sup> 27; Schubart, *GP*, Abb. 84, and Roberts, *GLH* 19b.

Iota adscript is not written. No accents, breathings, quantity marks or punctuation are in evidence. The papyrus overlaps at 772 with **4557**; at 768–84 it overlaps with **4559**.

On the back, across the fibres and the other way up, are parts of twenty-nine much damaged lines in a small rapid semi-cursive hand, to be assigned to the third century; publication of this is reserved for a later volume.

- 765 [η γαρ τιν αλλον ετεκες η κεινους] γυναι[ι]  
 [ανονητα γ ως εοικε τονδ ον ε]ιζορα[ις]  
 [που δ ων ετυγχαν ηνικ ωλλυτο] πτολις  
 [πατηρ νιν εξεπεμφεν ορρωδω]ν θανειν  
 [ποι των τοτ οντων χωρισας τεκν]ων μονον  
 770 [εσ τηνδε χωραν ουπερ ηυρεθη θα]νων  
 [προς ανδρ ος αρχει τηςδε Πολυμ]ηστωρ χθον[ος]  
 [ενταυθ επεμφθη πικροτατου χ]ρυσου φυλα[ξ]  
 [θνησκει δε προς του και τινος ποτ]μου τυχων  
 [τινος γ υπ αλλου Θρηξ νιν ωλεσε] ξενος  
 775 [ω τλημον η που χρυσον ηρασθη λα]βειν  
 [τοιαυτ επειδη συμφοραν εγνω] Φρυγω[v]  
 [ηυρες δε που νιν η τις ηνεγκεν ν]εκρον  
 [ηδ εντυχουσα ποντιας ακτης ε]πι  
 [τουτον ματευους η πονους αλλο]ν πονον  
 780 [λουτρ ωιχετ οικους εξ αλος Πολυ]ξενη  
 [κτανων νιν ως εοικεν εκβαλλε]ι ξενος  
 [θαλασσοπλαγκτον γ ωδε διατεμω]ν χροα  
 [ω cχετλια cy των αμετρητων πο]νων  
 [ολωλα κουδεν λοιπον Αγαμεμνον κακω]ν

767 πτολις: rightly with M and B, two of the best medieval MSS, and also with PPaξZZcG<sup>2</sup>Zm<sup>1c</sup> and T<sup>1</sup>. As far as T<sup>1</sup> is concerned, Matthiessen gives line 767 as an example showing that Triklinios did not depend on



the tradition ‘sondern auch aus eigenen Kraft die einfachste Emendation finden mochte’ (K. Matthiessen, *Studien zur Textüberlieferung der Hekabe des Euripides*, Heidelberg 1974, 105). The papyrus here preserves the correct reading against the unmetrical πόλις preserved by ΩZm and T<sup>z</sup>.

769 τεκν]ων: or παιδ]ων with **4559** and GKR? τέκνων rell.

771 Πολυμ]ηστωρ: the papyrus here agrees with Ω and T<sup>z</sup> (although it did not agree with them in 767), XXbZ. Contrary to Diggle, Daitz in his apparatus criticus says that L attests Πολυμηστωρ.

778 ακτηρς ε]πι is probable (with **4559**) but I cannot exclude αλορς ε]πι, the reading of LPZ.

V. GIANOPOULOU

### 4561. EURIPIDES, *HECUBA* 1252–70

15 2B.32/B(a)  
Π<sup>10</sup> Diggle  
M.–P. 390.1

5.2 × 10.7 cm

Third century

This fragment joins VI **877**, and supplies the middles of E. *Hec.* 1252–70, of which the beginnings (1252–69 plus parts of 1271–80) are preserved in **877** (Π<sup>2</sup> Diggle; pl. XVIII in Donovan, *Euripides Papyri*). In Bouquiaux-Simon and Mertens (*Pap. Lup.* 1 (1992) 99 and Diggle’s edition the two papyri are listed as separate MSS, M.–P<sup>3</sup> 390 and 390.1 = Π<sup>2</sup> and Π<sup>10</sup>), which are now seen to be from the same MS. Diggle’s edition does not take into account lines 1252–55 and 1270 in **4561**, and its reports of one or both of the two papyri failing to attest a reading can in most cases be eliminated. According to W. Luppe, *APF* 37 (1991) 79, the two are ‘offenbar ohne textkritische Bedeutung’, but see below.

Written across the fibres; the other side is blank. This, together with the fact that the lines come from very near the end of the play (which ends at 1295), suggests that this is the first side of the last leaf of a codex (or of the last leaf before the beginning of another play, if this was a multi-work codex) with its other side left blank (contra: Donovan, *Euripides Papyri* 80). Moreover there is a fold running diagonally from upper right to lower left, typical of the corners of codex pages. An additional 15 lines after the end of **877** (i.e. after line 1280) will have been required to reach the end of the play; these must have been written as a continuation of the present column, since the back of **877** (which shows the top of the page) is blank. (On the absence of verse books written in double-column format, see Turner, *Typology* 35.) Thus the page held at least 45 lines, and more if the play text were followed by a colophon giving name of author and/or title.

To judge from the adjoining **877**, there were no marginal indications of speakers, but paragraphoi are used to indicate change of speaker in this passage of stichomythia. Diaeresis occurs in 1257 and 1263; otherwise, there is no evidence of punctuation, breathings, accents or critical signs. In two respects the scribe’s procedure is inconsistent. Iota adscript is written in 1260 ναυστοληρηι and 1276 αυτωι, but omitted in 1265 [γ]ενηρηι and 1272 επωδον. Elision is effected at 1259, 1268, 1275, 1276, 1277 (but never marked), yet at 1257, 1265, 1266 *scriptio plena* is written. Iotacistic orthography is exhibited in 1258 (τειμ[ωρουμενην]). In 1263 ανβη[ρηι has been written for ἀμβήρηι.

The stylish hand is angular and spiky and slopes slightly to the right. It shows limited

decoration and only occasional shading; there are slight ticks at the top of ι and κ and on the top horizontal of ζ, and sometimes on the top horizontal of τ and on the foot of ζ. There is considerable contrast between the widths of letters. Their height gives an impression of consistency, but the notional bottom line is regularly violated by γ, ρ, and χ, and also at times unusually by the first upright of π and by τ and distinctively by the nose of α. Tiny ο; γ in two strokes with arcing arms, the left one short and separate from the right which continues into the stem. Some connection between letters, e.g. from middle bar of ε to the following letter (1258 εχ), and occasionally from τ or π. The small floating ο, the vertical elongation of letters, and the oval shaped ε, ς, and θ suggest the ‘Severe Style’: cf. the hand of VII 1016 (Roberts, *GLH* 20a) and XXVII 2458 (Turner, *GMAW*<sup>2</sup> 32), both assigned to the third century. Donovan compares XIX 2208 (Callimachus, *Αἰτίων α'*) and VII 1012 (Treatise on literary composition; official accounts on recto), the latter after 204–5. 4561 is perhaps slightly later, but probably still within the first half of the century. The generously spaced hand and consistently good readings point to a better than average copy of *Hecuba*.

877 was previously studied by Donovan, *Euripides Papyri*, 78–80 (no. 19). What he notes for 877, that ‘there is no evidence for correction, nor does any seem to have been in order’ cannot be entirely sustained in the light of 4561 (see 1263; also 1275 n., 1276 n.). However, at 1276 (from 877) the papyrus yields an original reading adopted by Diggle. At 1267 it presents an variant order of words represented in only one MS (Sa). A trace of ink on the new fragment which cannot be accommodated in 1271, intact at this point, shows the papyrus contained 1270, a line which has been corrupted in transmission (‘suspectus’ Murray), and that Donovan’s suspicion that 1270 was the connecting line between the two pieces of 877 is true.

4561 is printed in boldface, 877 in normal-weight type.

	<u>οιμο[ι</u>	]	[		]
	<u>δουλη[ς</u>	]	.	[	]
	<u>ουκου[ν</u>	]	.	[	]
1255	<u>οιμο[ι</u>	]	[	]	
	<u>αλγει[ς τι . . . παιδ]ος [ουκ αλγειν δοκεις]</u>				
	<u>χαιρε[ι]ς ὑβριζ[ουσ ει]ς εμε ω π[ανουργε συ]</u>				
	<u>ου γαρ με χαιρειν [χ]ρη σε τειμ[ωρουμενην]</u>				
	<u>αλλ ου τυχ ηνικ αγ ξε ποντια [νοτις]</u>				
1260	<u>μων γαυστοληχη γης ορου[ς Ελληνιδος]</u>				
	<u>κρ[ν]ψη[ ] μεν ουν πεσουσαν ε[κ καρχησιων]</u>				
	<u>προς τ[ο]υ βιαιων τυχανου[σαν αλματων]</u>				
	<u>αυτη προς ἴστον ναος ανβη[χηι ποδι]</u>				
	<u>υποπ[τ]εροις νωτοιειν η ποιω[ι τροπωι]</u>				



1270 ] [, prima facie a high tight bowl or hook directly below the  $\alpha$  of  $\pi\sigma\tau'$   $\dot{\alpha}\nu$  in 1269, possibly the left end of the upper stroke of a  $z$ , which we would expect from the transmitted  $\eta$   $\zeta\acute{\omega}c$ ' at this position in 1270. This trace cannot be from any part of 1271 (assuming 1270 to have dropped), because the corresponding words at this position are fully preserved on **877**.

Additional notes on **877**:

1271  $c\omega[\iota$  BAGLZZcT<sup>2</sup>K<sup>1c</sup>R<sup>3</sup>V<sup>2</sup>, and accepted by Diggle:  $c\acute{\omicron}\nu$   $\Omega\xi ZmG^*Z^*T^*$ . The papyrus here sides with one of the two main MS families (ABL) against the other (MVPO).

1272 The papyrus does not substantiate Nauck's emendation  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\omicron}\nu\nu\mu\acute{\omicron}\nu$   $\tau\iota$ .

The reading of **877**  $\mu$ [ (top and bottom of an upright connected at top to the rounding saddle of  $\mu$  which continues half-way, ruling out  $\eta$ ), supplemented by Grenfell and Hunt to read  $\mu[\eta]$   $\tau\iota$ , is an original reading here, accepted by Diggle and defended by him in *Studies on the Text of Euripides* (1981) 120:  $\eta$   $\Omega\xi Z^*T^*Z^*$ . Grenfell and Hunt regarded  $\mu\eta$   $\tau\iota$  as 'a doubtful improvement on the mss. reading'.

1274  $\mu]e\lambda e\iota$   $\Omega$ :  $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda e\iota$  FRT<sup>2</sup> ( $\sim T^{2c}$ ).

$\gamma\acute{\epsilon}$   $\mu\omicron\iota$   $\Omega$ , accepted by Diggle:  $\gamma'$   $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\iota$  SaSZB. The scribe's inconsistent procedure in the treatment of elision makes the papyrus indecisive.

1275  $Kaca[\nu\delta\rho\alpha\nu$  AGLRSVZcZmTz:  $Kacc\acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\alpha\nu$   $\Omega Z$ , accepted by Diggle.

1276  $av\tau\omega\iota$   $\Omega$ , accepted by Diggle:  $a\acute{\upsilon}\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$  PSa. See 1267 n.: unlike there, the papyrus does not here agree with Sa in an unusual variant. The same is true at 1257.

After  $av\tau\omega\iota$  there is room for  $co\iota$  but not for  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\alpha$  which precedes  $co\iota$  in the MSS, probably a mechanical omission, which however makes it uncertain whether the line ended  $\epsilon[\chi e\iota\nu$  as transmitted.

1279 **877** may have read  $\gamma\epsilon$  with LYn. But as Grenfell and Hunt note, the trace is insufficient to rule out  $c\epsilon$ ,  $\delta\epsilon$  and  $\tau\epsilon$  which are also variously transmitted here.

E. MADISON

#### 4562. EURIPIDES, *HERCULES* 32–40

8i 2B.85/10(a)

2 × 4.5 cm

Late second/third century

Fragment from a book roll. The back is blank except for possible offsets. Written along the fibres, the fine small hand is neat and careful. There is a more marked than usual contrast between large, wide letters ( $\alpha$ ,  $\gamma$ ,  $\Delta$ ,  $\eta$ ,  $\kappa$ ,  $\nu$ ,  $\pi$ ,  $\tau$ ,  $\phi$ ) and tiny, narrow letters floating near the top line ( $\epsilon$ ,  $\omicron$ ,  $c$ ,  $\omega$ ). There is occasional decoration. For the cursive  $\alpha$  in a bookhand cf. VI **852** (Euripides, *Hypsipyle*, otherwise in a quite different style). The hand is extraordinarily similar to XXX **2529** (a codex: plates 3, 13) and may well be the work of the same writer. We cannot believe that **2529** can be as late as the fourth-century date assigned to it by Lobel.

Column width by calculation, assuming no major textual discrepancies, c. 10 cm; height unknown. There is no opportunity to observe punctuation, if there was any. Elision is apparently effected tacitly in 34 (and so transcribed in 35, but the papyrus is broken immediately after  $\tau$ ), but apparently not effected in 40 (see n.). There is no opportunity to observe whether iota adscript was written.

The papyrus provides a unique but trivial variant ( $\epsilon\pi e\iota c-$ ) in 34. In 40, the papyrus shows  $\epsilon$  before  $\acute{\omega}c$ , preceded by a possible  $\tau$ , which, if correct, would confirm a correction proposed by Canter.

[Καδμειος ουκ ων αλλ απ] Εὐβο[ιας μολων]  
 [κτεινει Κρεοντα κ]αι κτανων [αρχει χθονος]  
 [στασει νοσουσαν την]δ̄ επεισπ[εσων πολιν]  
 35 [ημιν δε κηδος εκ Κρ]εοντ [ανημμενον]  
 [κακον μεγαστον ως] εοικε γι[γνεται]  
 [τουμου γαρ οντος π]αιδος ε[ν μυχοις χθονος]  
 [ο καινος ουτος της]δε γης α[ρχων Λυκος]  
 [τους Ηρακλειους παι]δας εξ[ελειν θελει]  
 40 [κτανων δαμαρτα] τε ως φο[νωι εβεσχι φονον]

34 The manuscripts read unproblematically *ἐπεσπεδων*, accepted by editors. Since *-π-* make position, the choice between reading *ἐπεε-* with the MSS or *ἐπειε-* with the papyrus will not be determined by metre. Most likely *εic* is a Koine spelling which has crept into the text.

40 *τε*: or possibly *γε*. As transmitted in the medieval MSS, the text is unmetrical: a stop is wanted to block elision after *δάμαρτα* (L: *δάμαρτ' Tr'*). Canter proposed *⟨θ'⟩*. If read as *τε*, the papyrus would confirm Canter's correction (i.e. *θ' ὡς* written in *scriptio plena* as *τε ὡς*). It is true that 34 would lead us to expect the scribe to elide here, but his practice may simply have been inconsistent. *γε* could be contemplated, but *τε* gives better sense by linking *δάμαρτα* to *κάμ'* in 41 ('to annihilate Heracles' children by killing both his wife and me'). *γε* would place undue emphasis on *δάμαρτα*.

T. NELSON

### 4563. EURIPIDES, *HERCULES* 551–60

102/142(a)

4.5 × 6.4 cm

Late second/third century

Fragment from the middle of a column originally c. 13 cm wide, written along the fibres. The hand is a rounded capital, rapidly written, in much the same style as P. Bodm. II, Gospel acc. to St John (Turner, *GMAW*<sup>2</sup> 63, earlier third century), with some recollection of the chancery style (especially κ: see LXVI 4503), perhaps pointing to a private copy. Letters, especially ε, are frequently touched by the letter following, giving an impression of flattened, horizontal extension in the hand generally. The horizontal bar of η is very high. ω floats between notional top and bottom line (556), but is fully raised in the middle (i.e. not flat-bottomed). λ and λ sometimes have a hook over the left at top. V-shaped γ in 553 with slight blobs on the ends of the arcs. The letters vary in size both separately and between different examples of the same letter.

Elision is marked by apostrophe in 552 and 554; the former might have been inserted by a second hand. No other reading aids occur. There is no opportunity to observe whether the scribe wrote iota adscript. In the nine partially preserved lines there are at least three mistakes, two of which have been deleted, with corrections (or variants) written above by



Με. βία, πατήρ μὲν ἐκπεσὼν τρωτοῦ λέχουκ  
 Ηρ. κοῦκ ἔσχευ αἰδῶς τὸν γέροντ' ἀτιμάσαι;  
 Με. αἰδῶς; ἀποικεῖ τῆδε τῆς θεοῦ πρόσω.

556 αἰδῶς Pearson, CR 38 (1924) 13; αἰδῶ L 557 αἰδῶς; Badham; αἰδῶς γ' L

Wilamowitz saw that 'this goddess' in 557 was *Αἰδῶς*, and that therefore she could not be the subject of ἀποικεῖ, yet various suggestions for taking *Aidos* as the subject of the verb have been advanced: (a) Murray's, that τῆδε τῆς θεοῦ means *Δυστυχία*; (b) Elmsley's αἰδῶς ἀποικεῖ τῆδε τῆς χθονὸς πρόσω; and (c) Hartman's αὐτῆ γὰρ οἰκεῖ τῆδε γῆς πρόσω θεός, an approach revived by Cropp, who suggested τῆδε γῆς θεὸς πρόσω. Wilamowitz, on the other hand, kept L's αἰδῶ in 556 and in 557 he printed Scaliger's αἰδῶ γ' (the γ' already in L), which he and Scaliger intended as an ironic interjection: 'Shame indeed!'

Scaliger printed an accusative, suspecting that a word so used to query or mock an interlocutor's word must be in the same case as the queried or mocked word. Diggle, *Studies in the Text of Euripides*, 50–1, shows by examples that this intuition is right. But he also shows that L's γ', which is metrically necessary for Scaliger's conjecture, is entirely unwanted in this context. This might lead to the conclusion that in Amphitryon's reply (557) we must accept Badham's αἰδῶς; ἀποικεῖ κτλ. and in Heracles' question (556) we must accept Pearson's οὔκ ἔσχευ αἰδῶς τὸν γέροντ' ἀτιμάσαι;

The papyrus does not confirm Pearson's conjecture in 556: it gives the reading of L. In itself this is not very weighty. But it also removes the necessity of a conjecture here, since 557 as given by the papyrus clearly did not have a form of αἰδῶς followed by ἀποικεῖ, and it was only this feature of 557 that made it necessary to alter 556. L's οὔκ ἔσχευ αἰδῶ is perfectly acceptable: see *IT* 949 οἱ δ' ἔσχον αἰδῶ (and, for expressions equivalent to ἔσχευ αἰδῶ, ἔσχευ φόβον, or the like, *Med.* 1202, *Hip.* 998, 1204, *HF* 950, *Trö.* 977, *IT* 1380, *Pho.* 330, *Or.* 189, *IA* 431); it also yields a personal subject for ἔσχευ since the singular verb at least suggests 'he' and therefore Lycus, while ἔσχευ αἰδῶς without accusative object leaves it quite open to question who is to be thought of, and Lycus has not been mentioned since 547. Euripides also does not use αἰδῶς ἔσχει, φόβος ἔσχει, ἔρωκ ἔσχει, or the like without an accusative object. For αἰδῶς (ἔρωκ, φόβος, etc.) μ' ἔσχει, see *Med.* 356, *Hec.* 970, *Su.* 178, *HF* 515, *Ion* 572, *Pho.* 622, *Or.* 101, 460, 1255, 1324, *Ba.* 828, *IA* 1410, *Rh.* 722, 859, *Hyps.* fr. 64.76 Bond. All these have accusative objects. The two examples cited by Bond ad loc. where αἰδῶς (or allied expressions) have no object are much easier: in the first, *Hom. Il.* 15.657, the preceding sentence naturally suggests the object; in the second, *A. Eu.* 690–1, *κέβας ἀτρώων φόβος τε κυγγενῆς* suggests ἀτρώως as the object of *κυγγενῆς*.

At the beginning of the line the most plausible reading is δῆ, perhaps τί δῆ. But τί δῆ τί δῆτα is an impossible sequence of words: it might be suspected that the scribe wrote τι δη in dittography, writing *δητιδηδ*. (the last two letters corrected to τα) where he meant to write τί δῆτα. With *τιδηδ* eliminated, a plausible restoration of the line might be, e.g. [αἰδῶ; τί] δῆτα τῆς[δ' ἔσχει θεοῦ μέρος;], adopting a beginning as in L, but abandoning its full form (αἰδῶς γ').

The alternative would be to suppose that *δητιδητα* was actually what the writer or his copy intended, e.g. [πῶς] δῆ; τί δῆτα τῆς[δ' ἔσχει θεοῦ μέρος;]. But πῶς is too short for the space: 5–7 letters are expected before *δητι* on the basis of a reconstruction of the previous and following line-beginnings as transmitted. In view of this, *δῆτα* occupies the fourth and fifth syllables in the line, probably preceded by τί. However, τί δῆτα occurs in the Euripidean trimeter usually at the beginning. When it does not, it begins in the second foot and is preceded by an interjection or an emotional vocative (*Hcl.* 433, *Hip.* 806, 1060, *Andr.* 443, *Hec.* 313, *Su.* 734, *HF* 1146, *Ion* 253). Thus perhaps [οὔμουν τί] δῆτα τῆς[δ' ἔσχει θεοῦ μέρος;] might be tried; for *δῆτα* in scornful or incredulous questions addressed to an interlocutor ('what conceivable share does Lycus have in that goddess?') see, e.g., *El.* 834. The interjection would express pain at the idea that someone might suppose Lycus ever showed αἰδῶς. It is harder to see how a question introduced by τί δῆτα could have fitted into the context of the stichomythia. Alternatively the first letters could be articulated ]δ' ῆ and the line supplemented as follows: [ῆρον τόδ; ῆ τι δῆτα τῆς[δ' ἀσκεῖ θεόν;]; for indignant ῆρον τόδ, see *El.* 275. For ῆ . . . δῆτα see *S. OT* 429. Against this is that in the two places on the papyrus where elision is certain, it is marked by apostrophe. But otherwise we must assume a large error left only partially (and incompetently) corrected.

If ἤρου τόδ'; ἤ τι δῆτα τήνδ' ἀκκεῖ θεόν; or something like it was the reading of the papyrus, then L's reading might be secondary, and the papyrus might lend some help with the textual problem already recognized. Against this is the plausibility of ἀποικεῖ τῆδε τῆς θεοῦ πρόσω, which is vigorous and the reverse of banal, qualities one does not expect in a secondary reading. Yet at *Su.* 433–4 L reads γεγραμμένων δὲ τῶν νόμων ὃ τ' ἀσθενῆς / ὁ πλούσιός τε τὴν δίκην ἔσχη, but Stobaeus has two vigorous lines in place of the first: οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν κρείσσον ἢ νόμοι πόλει καλῶς τεθέντες· ὃ τε γὰρ ἀσθενέστερος. There is a less dramatic instance at *Med.* 752, on which see D. Kovacs, *Euripidea* (Leiden, 1994), 170–1, though there the alteration is more explicable. In short, the papyrus reading may be primary.

Even if it is not, it has forced reconsideration of the best way to emend L. In 556 L's οὐκ ἔχεν αἰδῶ, now confirmed by the papyrus, looks right (or at least ancient), and if we are to keep ἀποικεῖ κτλ. in 557, we might consider κείνός γ' ἀποικεῖ (Heimsoeth) or Λύκος γ' ἀποικεῖ, 'Lycus, at any rate, dwells far from that goddess'. L's γ' is now explained (γε = *saltem*), and αἰδῶς in the MSS could be a marginal explanatory note on 'this goddess' incorrectly interpreted as a correction of the first word in the line. This reading is compatible with either L's ἔχεν or the papyrus' ἔχον.

559 After ἀνδρ prima facie a rounded letter, ε or ο, apparently followed by part of a high horizontal (τ).

R. DILCHER  
D. KOVACS  
M. RICHTER

#### 4564. EURIPIDES, *TROADES* 340–6

104/62(a)

4.9 × 5.5 cm

Late third/fourth century  
Plate I

A small fragment of a roll with the left-hand part of a column and the left-hand margin. The text is written along the fibres. The height of the original column is unknowable; the 7 lines occupy 3.7 cm and the maximum 9 letters occupy 3.8 cm. The back is blank.

The hand is round, of medium to small size, well executed and with serious pretensions to formality. It appears close to Schubart, *GP* Abb. 93 and a lesser relative of Turner, *GMAW*<sup>2</sup> 26 or Roberts, *GLH* 22b.

Lines 1 and 2 are inset and this suggests that Cassandra's whole monody was in *eisthesis*; indentation is often used to mark a change from longer to shorter verses. The acute accent in 340 seems to have been written by the original scribe. Just below 340 and close to its first letter there is a forked mark combined with a miniature coronis, indicating the end of Cassandra's monody. Paragraphus between 342–3 marks change of speaker.

. . . . .

340                    τον [πεπρωμενον ευναι]  
                         > πός[ιν εμεθεν]

341 ] . βι<sup>ο</sup> βασιλεια β[ακχεουσαν ου ληψηι κορην]  
                         μη κουφο[ν αρηι βημ ες Αργειων στρατον]  
                         Ηφα[ι]ςτε δα[ιδουχεις μεν εν γαμοις βροτων]  
                         αταρ λυγρ[αν γε τηνδ αναιθυσσεις φλογα]



345 [εξω] τε με[γαλων ελπίδων οίμοι τεκνον]  
[ωσ ο]υχ υ[π] α[ιχημησ

341 ], βι°. The marginal note, an abbreviation for *Ταλθύβιος*, was probably written by the main scribe. Σ ad loc. *ταῦτά τινες τῶι Ταλθυβίωι, τινές δὲ τῶι χορῶι ἐπιμερίζουσιν.*

343 The area where a marginal abbreviation for *Ἐκάβη* might have stood is broken away.

344 λυγρ[αν]. The papyrus agrees with V and gives support to Diggle's reading in the OCT text against Q's *λυπράν* and P's *πικράν*.

V. GIANNOPOULOU

**4565.** EURIPIDES, *IPHIGENIA IN TAURIS* 1340–52, 1367–78

101/94(b)

Fr. a 3.2 × 9.1 cm

Second century

Two fragments with line beginnings, fr. a with the top of a column, fr. b with the foot. If the fragments are part of the same column (which seems inevitable, yet it has not been possible to confirm it from the vertical fibres on the back), the column would have contained 39 lines with a written height of c. 21 cm and a roll height of at least 26 cm; the intercolumnium was at least 3.6 cm. No lectional signs. Formal literary hand with mixed letter forms (cf. XXVII **2452** = Turner, *GMAW*<sup>2</sup> 27; I **26** = Roberts *GLH* no. 19a). Iota adscript was written in 1343. The back is blank.

There are no new readings; line 1346, which has been deleted or transposed by editors, appears in its usual place.

Fr. a

1340 [εσ]ηλθε[ν  
κ[τ]αγοι[εν  
φοβω δ[  
αιγηι [  
στειχ[ειν  
1345 καντ[αυθ  
ταρσ[ωι  
ν[αυτας  
ε[χοντας  
ελ[ευθερουσ  
1350 κοντο[ις  
αγκυ[ραν  
σπ[ευδοντες

Fr. b

κ[εινοι  
 ημ[εικ  
 κα[ι  
 1370 εικ π[λευρα  
 ωστ[ε  
 δειν[οικ  
 εφε[υγομεν  
 [κ]αθα[ιμ  
 1375 οχθοι[ε  
 εμαρν[αμεσθα  
 αλλ ε[ιργον  
 ςτα[θεντες

1346 The papyrus shows the presence of this line, against Diggle's suggestion to delete it, or Hermann's transposition after 1394.

1370 εικ: ἐκ MSS (cf. R. Kannicht (ed.), *Euripides, Helena*, Heidelberg 1969, i. 108).

1377 First λ a correction.

K. BÜHLER  
C. SELZER

#### 4566. EURIPIDES, *PHOENISSAE* 1327–37

106/27(a)

3.2 × 8.1 cm

First century  
Plate I

This scrap of a papyrus roll is written along the fibres with a thin pen in a large and unusual round book hand, laboriously executed. The hand has horizontal finials on the feet of every letter that offers the possibility and finials at the tops of many uprights as well, generally to the left but sometimes projecting both left and right. More extraordinary are the vertical upward serifs at the ends of the horizontal of τ, done with separate strokes, and sometimes extending below the horizontal as well. The angular construction of ρ is also distinctive. The V-shaped bowl of γ and the same shape used in ϣ seem to spring from the letter base. The back is blank.

The papyrus casts direct light on variants only at 1328.

[πωσ φηικ νεκυν τοι παιδο]ε αγα[παζων εμου]  
 [ουκ ες τοδ ηλθον ωστε κ]αι τα[.]δ' ε[ιδεναι]

- 1330 [αλλ οιχεται μεν ση κασιγν]ητη πα[λαι]  
 [δοκω δ αγωνα τον π]ερι ψυχης K[ρεον]  
 [ηδη πεπραχθαι παιει τ]οικω Oιδιπ[ου]  
 [οιμοι το μεν σημειον] εισορω τοδ[ε]  
 [σκυθρωπον ομμα και] προσωπον [αγγελου]  
 [στειχοντος ος παν αγ]γελε το δρ[ωμενον]  
 1335 [ω ταλας εγω τιν ειπω μυθ]ον η τινας [  
 [οιχομεσθ ουκ ευπροσωποις] φρ[οιμοις αρχηι λογου]  
 [ω ταλας διςωσ αυτω μεγα]λα γ[αρ φερω κακα]

1328 τα[. ]δ' Ω: τόδ' RRfSW.

1332 Unexplained mark above and to the right of ω of εισορω.

1334 παν αγ]γελε Ω: ἡμῶν ἀγγ- PRW: ἡμῶν ἀναγγ- S.

1335 μυθ]ον Ω: λόγον Rf (ἦ om.) and <sup>81</sup>V<sup>2</sup>CrFX.

τινας [γοους] BRf: τῖνας λόγους ΩXZTΓ: τῖνα λόγον RSW.

1337 γ[αρ om. AS.

D. KOVACS

**4567.** EURIPIDES, *ORESTES* 599–601 (+ 2 FURTHER LINES)

100/108 (a)

2.3 × 2.3 cm

Second/third century

A tiny scrap from a papyrus roll; the back is blank. The small script, written along the fibres, is a formal mixed style, related to the 'Severe' Style, and allows the papyrus to be assigned to the later second century or the early third century.

The remains of the papyrus do not allow conclusions about the dimensions of the column or roll. There are no traces of any reading marks. Following a correction, elision is marked in line 600. The insertion of *ουκ* in line 601 is probably by the main scribe.

There are no overlaps with previously published papyri of Euripides' *Orestes*. The text following 601 appears to be wildly different from the medieval MSS.

- 600 [ει μη κελευσας ρυσεται] με μη θαν[εω]  
 [αλλ ωσ μεν ουκ ευ μη λ]εγ[[ε]]' ειργαστα[ι ταδε]  
 [ημιν δε τοις δρασας]ιν ουκ' ευδαιμ[ονωσ]  
 [ c. 16 ]γε. [1–2]ησα[  
 [ c. 16 ]μ.[. . .].]

After 601 ]ησα[ suggests 608 ἀλγῆσαι, but the rest of the traces and spacing will not fit. The line after that

could coincide with 603 ([μακαριος αιων οικ δε] μη [πι]π[τουειν ευ]) but this is useless speculation in view of the uncertainty of the preceding line.

A. SPEYER

**4568.** EURIPIDES, *RHESUS* 839–47

68 6B.20/L(10–13)b

3.8 × 5.8 cm

Third century

Beginnings of nine lines of a roll from a column incomplete at top and bottom, with an intercolumnium of at least 2.5 cm. Written along the fibres, the back is blank. The hand is a formal semi-cursive documentary script of official type rather than a literary hand, much resembling the less ligatured portions of XLVII **3345** (AD 209). In such a hand, the flamboyant initial ornate  $\alpha$  in 842 does not call for special comment, but the inelegant  $\gamma$  (847) with rounded bowl in a separate stroke is striking.

. . . . .

840  $\alpha$ [πων εραθεις ων εκατι συμμαχους]  
 τους ζ[ουc φονευεις πολλ επισκηπτων μολειν]  
 ηλθε[ν τεθνασι ευπρεπεστερον Παρις]  
 ξενια[ν κατηιςχυν η συ συμμαχους κτανων]  
 μη γαρ [τι λεξηις ωc τιc Αργειων μολων]  
 διωλες [ημαc τιc αν υπερβαλων λοχουc]  
 845 Τρωων [εφ ημαc ηλθεν ωcτε και λαθειν]  
 [[ς]ου προc[θεν ημων ηcο και Φρυγων cτρατοc]  
 τιc ουν [  
 . . . . .

841 ηλθε[ν unattested and unwanted; ἦθρον MSS.

846 *cu* MSS. Apparently *c* here has been overwritten with *ο*, probably by another hand. *οὐ* or *οδ* is unattested, and produces exactly the opposite of the desired sense which had been achieved by the original version.

D. OBBINK

## II. DEMOSTHENES

### 4569–4580. DEMOSTHENES, XIX (*DE FALSA LEGATIONE*)

Among previously published papyri, *Περὶ τῆς παραπρεσβείας* (speech XIX) is the second most frequently exemplified speech of Demosthenes on papyrus after *Περὶ τοῦ στεφάνου*. In **4569–4580** we give editions of a further twelve ancient copies of Demosthenes XIX, being all those so far identified among the holdings of the Egypt Exploration Society. These additions to the list of ancient manuscripts of Demosthenes roughly double the number of published papyri containing Demosthenes XIX. The new fragments for the most part represent professionally made copies produced between the second and fourth centuries AD. The figures and tables for papyri of Demosthenes given by P. J. Sijpesteijn, *Cd'E* 38 (1963) 297–305, id. *BASP* 2 (1964) 33–4 are now out of date, as are those of B. Hausmann, *Demosthenis fragmenta in papyris et membranis servata* (Diss. Leipzig 1921). Hausmann's catalogue is continued (up to 1981) by P. Mertens, 'Papyrus et parchemins d'origine égyptienne édités après la Dissertation de B. Hausmann', included in *Pars tertia* (pp. 138–9 for Demosth. XIX) of the publication of Hausmann's dissertation, ed. R. Pintaudi, *Papyrologica Florentina* 4 (1978) and *Pap. Flor.* 8 (1981), and we give an up-to-date list below. For frequency of occurrences of MSS of Demosthenes at Oxyrhynchus see J. Krüger, *Oxyrhynchos in der Kaiserzeit* (1990) 214–19, cf. 318, showing Demosthenes to be the most frequently exemplified prose author there, with Plato a close second. The new fragments confirm rather than alter the impression there that the finds of Demosthenes at Oxyrhynchus cluster in the second–third centuries. A table amalgamating sections of the speech covered by the new fragments published here for the first time with those already known follows. The numbers of Pack<sup>2</sup> or Mertens–Pack<sup>3</sup> are given where they have been assigned. The order is that of sections in Demosthenes XIX witnessed by the papyri, with entries repeated in italics where more than one section of the speech is covered, in order to indicate overlapping papyrus witnesses to the text. (BB = back blank; n.k. = not known.)

In addition, III **410** 103–7 (rhetorical treatise, ii AD) gives exactly the same extent of the quotation of Euripides (*Phoenix* fr. 812 Nauck<sup>2</sup>), as that quoted from Aeschines I 152 at Demosthenes XIX 245, suggesting that it attests the text of one or both of these speeches at these points.

Of further interest for points of textual tradition and formatting conventions (*ekthesis*, written as prose) in literary texts are those places in which poetry is quoted by Demosthenes: **4577**: § 243 Hesiod, *Op.* 763–4; **4577**, **4579**: § 245 Euripides, *Phoenix* fr. 812. 7–9 Nauck<sup>2</sup> (§ 247 Sophocles, *Antigone* 175–90; § 255 Solon fr. 4 West<sup>2</sup>). **4577** and **4579** at any rate make it clear that the quotations were present in some ancient MSS of Demosthenes. The new fragments, however, show no evidence of having contained the text of the documents (unlike some papyri of Demosthenes XVIII, for example: P. Ant. I 27, XI **1377**,

TABLE 2. *Papyri of Demosthenes XIX*

§§	(Mertens-) Pack <sup>2/(3)</sup>	Publication	Medium	Letters per line	Saec.	Prov.
1-7 etc.	291	<b>4569</b> + P. Lit. Lond. 126 [= XXII Haasm. ]	pap. cod.	29-40	iii/iv	Oxy.
9-13	291	<b>4569</b> + P. Lit. Lond. 126				
10	292	P. Grenf. II 9 [= XXIII Haasm. ] (cited as pap. Bodl. by Fuhr)	pap. sheet ↓ (→ official doc.)	27	i/ii init.	?Fay.
11-25 etc.	293	P. Lit. Lond. 127 [= XXIV Haasm. = F. Kenyon, JPh 22 (1894) = Membr. Grafiana = <i>GMAW</i> <sup>2</sup> 82 = Cavallo-Machler <i>GBEP</i> 3b. Once thought the earliest vellum codex; NB double columns: ii AD (as late as 200) acc. to Parsons <i>GMAW</i> <sup>2</sup> , redated to early iv by Cavallo-Machler]	parchm. cod.	22-29	iv	?Fay.
13 etc.	—	<b>4570</b>	pap. roll → BB	18	iii	Oxy.
17	—	<b>4570</b>				
27-8	293	P. Lit. Lond. 127				
30-1	(293.1)	P. Köln I 16	pap. roll → BB	31-40	ii	n.k.
30-2	293	P. Lit. Lond. 127				
50-1	—	<b>4571</b>	pap. roll → BB	22-6	iii	Oxy.
53-7	295	IX <b>1182</b> [= XXV Haasm. = <i>GMAW</i> <sup>2</sup> 67] [same scribe as <b>1093</b> <i>Contra Boeotum</i> , but not same roll]	pap. roll → (↓ lease AD 88)	7-14	i/ii init. (mid-ii Turner, <i>GMAW</i> <sup>2</sup> )	Oxy.
58-62	(295.1)	P. Yale I 22	pap. roll. ↓ (→ ined. lit. text, i)	28-30	ii ex.	n.k.
79-80	—	<b>4572</b>	pap. roll → BB	13-15	ii/iii	Oxy.
92-3	—	<b>4573</b>	pap. roll. → BB (↓ list of names)	12-13	ii	Oxy.
101-2	—	<b>4574</b>	pap. roll. → BB	27-9	ii	Oxy.
101-3 etc.	(295.2)	P. Yale II 101	pap. roll → BB	20-6	late ii	n.k.
109-11	(295.2)	P. Yale II 101				
113-14	(295.2)	P. Yale II 101				

148–9 etc.	—	<b>4575</b>	pap. roll → BB	14–16	iii	Oxy.
150–1	—	<b>4576</b>	pap. roll. → BB	11–14	iii–iv	Oxy.
154–8 etc.	—	<b>4577</b>	pap. roll. → BB	12–16	later iii	Oxy.
155–6	—	<b>4570</b>				
173–5	—	<b>4577</b>				
193–5	296	P. Mil. Vogl. I 13	pap. roll → ?BB	21–5	ii init.	Tebt.
202 etc.	(296.1)	P. Köln I 17	pap. roll ↓ (→ doc.)	23–6	i	n.k.
203–5	—	<b>4577</b>				
206	(296.1)	<i>P. Köln I 17</i>				
208–22	—	<b>4569</b>				
211	—	<b>4577</b>				
223	—	BKT IX 178	pap. roll → BB	15–17	iii	Herm.
223–4	—	<b>4575</b>				
231–2	—	<b>4577</b>				
234–40	—	<b>4577</b>				
237 etc.	—	<b>4578</b>	pap. roll → BB	22–4	ii/iii	Oxy.
240	—	<b>4578</b>	pap. cod.	36–8	iii/iv	Oxy.
241–3 etc.	—	<b>4579</b>				
243–5	—	<b>4577</b>				
245–6	—	<b>4579</b>	pap. roll → BB	17–22	ii–iii	Oxy.
251–2 etc.	(296.2)	PSI XVII Congr. 13 [hand v. like <b>4577</b> but longer lines]				
253–4	(296.2)	<i>PSI XVII Congr. 13</i>				
274–80	297	VIII <b>1094</b> [= XXXVI Hausm. ]	parchm. cod.	19–24	v	Oxy.
293–4	—	<b>4577</b>				
293–5	298	P. Tebt. II 267 [= XXVII Hausm. ]	pap. roll → ?BB	17–18	later ii	Tebt.
306–7	—	<b>4578</b>				
314–15	—	<b>4569</b>				
316	—	<b>4575</b>				
325	—	<b>4580</b>	pap. roll. → BB	16–19	ii/iii	Oxy.
Commentaries			pap. cod.		iii	Fay.
40–51, 99–158	294	MPER I 25				

P. Haun, I 5; cf. P. Köln VIII 334). Several of the new fragments (**4571**, **4578**) give evidence for wide (as opposed to relatively narrow) columns in oratory: cf. Kenyon, *Books*<sup>2</sup> 56–7, Johnson, *Proceedings of the 20th Congress of Papyrologists* 425–7.

**4569** is the first papyrus to witness the opening of the speech; **4580** contains the latest portion of the speech published so far. None of the papyri of Demosthenes XIX shows any sign of stichometric letters—perhaps only a coincidence, since many are not extensively preserved. But **4569** and **4577** are both sufficiently extensive to show conclusively that they never had any stichometry, nor for that matter scholia, obeloi, diplai, nor other signs of formal connection to ancient commentaries or the medieval scholia, other than the divergent readings witnessed by their texts or recorded as variants. Among other details (inconsistent agreement with one or another branch of the medieval tradition, conjunctive and separative errors, and the odd occasional unique and possibly correct reading), are the significant number of agreements (against the other branches) with A. The new instances offered by **4569–4580** at least prove the antiquity of these variants, and show that a subset of variants in A are more closely related to the manuscript tradition of certain papyri than to the other branches of the medieval tradition. See **4572** introd. For the textual tradition of Demosthenes see H. Erbse in H. Hunger et al., *Geschichte der Textüberlieferung i* (Zurich 1961) 262–4, and D. Irmer, *Philologus* 112 (1968) 43–62; id., *Zur genealogie der jüngeren Demostheneshandschriften* (Hamburg 1972), with reviews by N. G. Wilson, *CR* 24 (1974) 292 and M. Reeve, *CPh* 70 (1975) 297–9. Collation has been with (and lacuna supplied *exempli gratia* where plausible from) C. Fuhr's *editio maior* (Leipzig 1904). We have occasionally reported additional readings generously provided by Professor D. M. MacDowell from his own collations.

D. OBBINK

**4569. DEMOSTHENES XIX** 1–7, 9–13, 208–22, 309–10, 314–15

fr. 1: 115/44 + P. Lit. Lond. 126

fr. 1 13.5 × 29 cm

Third–fourth century

fr. 2: 49 5B.98/B(4/5)b

fr. 3: 85/80(a)

Papyrus codex, codicological rectos written along the fibres, versos against. Fr. 1 belongs to the same codex leaf as P. Lond. inv. 1546C, identified by Bell, P. Lond. V 1814C, printed from Bell's private transcript by Hausmann I 110–14 no. XXII, and republished by Milne as P. Lit. Lond. 126 = Pack<sup>2</sup> 291. The London fragment joins with fr. 1; the transcript below incorporates a re-edition of the London fragment based on autopsy of the original, and shows the portion of the text supplied by the new fragment in bold type. As a result, the provenance of the London fragment (previously unknown) is demonstrated, and previous editions can be corrected in a number of places (see nn. to fr. 1).

The new fragments show several new textual variants, some of them viable, viz. fr. 1 recto 15, 22, 27, 31, 46, verso 18 (see notes). Some deviations are due to scribal error: fr. 1 recto 22–3, 24. Fr. 1 also has lacunae in which there were clearly deviations from the medi-



eval tradition: recto 31, verso 7, 22; and different word orders at fr. 1 recto 15, 49, fr. 1 verso 20–1, 30, 43–4, 44–5, 49.

Iota adscript is generally written, occasionally omitted (fr. 1 recto 41, 45, 46, 46–7; verso 40 τ]ϖ is unclear). Sometimes the scribe writes *scriptio plena*, sometimes not, in which case elision is more often than not tacitly effected, less frequently signalled with apostrophe. At fr. 1 recto 43 final Ν is written as a raised horizontal stroke. εav is written at fr. 1 recto 44, av at fr. 1 recto 46; the form at fr. 1 recto 33 and 34 is unclear.

For the tightly written, right-leaning version of the later formal mixed style, Roberts *GLH* 17b (c. 175–200) shows the basic form, and Turner–Parsons *GMAW*<sup>2</sup> 43 (fourth century) a later development. The Demosthenes fragment falls somewhere between these two; Bell dated the hand to the late third century, but did not exclude early fourth. The character is aptly described by Turner’s generalisations (*Typology* 37): ‘an informal and workaday type, fairly quickly written, serviceable rather than beautiful, of value to a man interested in the content of what he is reading rather than its presentation; . . . “utility” books; margins are small, lines usually long.’

The average number of letters per line is 35 (1 counted as half), with a minimum of 29, a maximum of 40. The length of consecutive lines may differ by up to 6 letters (although there is some attempt made to keep the right margin even). The lines tend to get shorter towards the end of the page. The variability of line length coupled with the inconsistent practice concerning elision and unexpected textual variations from codd. often make supplements uncertain (see on fr. 1 recto 36–7, 49).

No ink appears on fr. 1 recto after line 53 nor on fr. 1 verso after line 53. These were therefore very probably the last lines on the page. The text interval between recto 53 υπo and verso 2 could have been contained in approximately 10 lines. Thus approximately 10 lines are missing from the top of the verso and, correspondingly, from the top of the recto. This gives 63 as the approximate number of lines per page. In fr. 2, which gives a complete column, there are 62 lines on the recto and 60 on the verso. The text from the beginning of Dem. 19 to fr. 1 recto 1 κωλυητε could have been contained in about 10 lines, or a little more: therefore the recto was probably the first page of the speech. There can then scarcely have been room for a title on the same page.

With 63 lines the columns of text were approximately 28.5 cm high. There was a lower margin of at least 2.7 cm, and presumably a similar upper margin, giving a height of approximately 34 cm for the page. The width of the text is approximately 10.5 cm. Side margins were each at least 2.3 cm. This yields a page width of at least 15 cm. With a single column per page, this would give the impression of being exceedingly tall and narrow, a member of Turner’s Group 8 Aberrant 1 (*Typology* 21 ‘much higher than broad’), for which IV **697** (Xenophon, *Cyropaedia*) provides a good comparison. Such a codex could have contained the whole of Dem. 19 in about 56 pages. Other speeches were probably contained in the same volume, if it were a single-quire codex, since recto → precedes verso ↓ at its beginning, and this arrangement still holds for fr. 3 with §§309–310 on recto → and §§314–5 on verso ↓, near the end of the speech. The narrower column width in fr. 3 should

be an argument in favour of a single quire, as the page width narrows towards the centre of the quire.

The following lectional signs are in evidence. Circumflex accent: fr. 2 recto 6. High point: fr. 1 recto 2, recto 37. Paragraphus, marking a sense-break in the preceding line: after fr. 1 recto 2 (with high point), 13, 26, 27, 30, 39, 47; fr. 1 verso 44. Diaeresis: fr. 1 recto 8 *περιῶν*; recto 14 *τουτονῖ*; fr. 1 verso 13 *ἴν*, 19, 20 and 21 *προσίων*, ?30 *ἰδι[α]*. At fr. 1 verso 38 *ουχ ὡς* has apparently been deleted by marks resembling circumflex accents.

## Fr. 1 recto

	κωλυτῆ [οἱ νομοὶ συ]γ[ηγαγον υ]μας ουχ ἵνα κ[υριας]	§ 1
	τοῖς ἀδικουσι ποιητῆ· τοὺς μὲν οὖν ἀλλοὺς [οσοὶ προσ]	§ 2
	τα κοινὰ δικαίως προσερχόνται καὶ δ[ε]δωκ[ότες ὦ]	
	εὐθυνας τὴν αἰλ[ογί]αν ὀρω πρ[ο]τεινομέ[νους του]	
5	τογί [δε Αἰς]χίγην π[ολυ τ]άναντια τουτων πρ[ιν γαρ εἰς]	
	ἐλθειν εἰς υμᾶς καὶ λογ[ο]ν δούναί των πεπρα[γμενων]	
	τον μὲν ἀνηρήκε των ἐπι τας εὐθυνας ἐλθοντ[ων]	
	τοῖς δ ἀπειλεῖ περιῶν δεινοτάτον παντῶν ἔθος [εἰς]	
	τὴν πολ[ι]τείαν εἰσαγῶν καὶ ἀσυμφωτάτον υ[μῖν]	
10	εἰ γὰρ ὁ π[ρα]ξίας τί τῶν κοινῶν καὶ διοικήσας τῶ[ι κα]	
	θ αὐτο[ν φοβῶι καὶ μ]ῆ τῶι δικαίῳ κατὰσκα[ε]υ[α]σε[ι μῆ]	
	δενά [εἶναι κατηγο]ρον αὐτοῦ παντ[α]παξι[ν ἀκυροὶ παν]	
	τῶν [υμεῖς γενήσε]σθε το μὲν οὖν ἐξελ[..... πολ]	§ 3
	λα κ[αὶ δεινα πεπο]ιηκότα τουτονῖ καὶ τ[ῆς ἐσχάτης]	
15	ἀξιογ[οντα τιμωρι]ας θάρρω καὶ πανυ π[ι]στευῶ	
	ὁ δὲ κ[αίπε]ρ [υπε]λήφως ταῦτα φοβουμαί φ[ρασω]	
	πρὸς υμᾶς καὶ οὐκ ἀποκρυψομαί ὅτι μοὶ δ[οκου]	
	εἰν ἀπα[ν]τες οἱ παρ υμῖν ἀγωνες οὐχ ἡττον ὦ ἀνδρες	
	Ἀθηναῖοι τῶν κ[α]ίρων ἢ των πραγμάτων ἐ[ι]γ[αί]	
20	καὶ τὸ χρόνον γεγενῆσθαι μετὰ τὴν πρεσβ[ε]ίαν]	
	πολὺν δεδοικα μὴ [τι]να ληθῆν καὶ συνηθειά[ν των]	
	ἀδικημάτων υμῖν ἐμπεποιήκεν ὡς δὴ μ[οὶ δο]	§ 4
	κεῖ ἀν ὁμῶς ἐκ [τ]ούτων καὶ γινῶναι τὰ δικ[αία καὶ]	
	δικασαὶ νῦνι τουθ υμῖν αὐτοῖς ὦ ἀνδρες Ἀθην[αῖοι]	
25	καὶ λογισαίσθε τινῶν τῆι πῶλει λόγον προση[κ]εῖ	
	παρα πρεσβευτοῦ λαβ[ε]ίγ πρῶτον μὲν τοῖνυ	

ων απηγγειλεν δευ[τ]ερον δε ων επεισεν τριτον  
 δε ω[ν π]ροσεταιξατε αυτω μετα ταυτα των χρονων  
 [εφ α]παι δε τρυτοις ει αδωροδοκητως [η] μη π[αν]  
 30 [τα ταυ]τα πεπρακται τι δηποτε τουτων εκαστο[.] § 5  
 [.....]οτι εκ μεν των απαγγελιων το β[ο]υλε[υ]  
 [.... περ]! των πραγματω[ν ορθω]ς υμιν εστι[ν]  
 [.. μ]εγ ουν ωσιν αλη[θ]ει[ς τα δεο]ντα εγνωτε  
 [ 2–3 δ]ε μη τοιαυται τα εν[αντια τ]ας δε συμβ[ουλι]  
 35 [ας πι]ςτοτερας υπολαμβ[ανετε ει]αι τας των [πρες]  
 [βε]ων ως γαρ ειδοτω[ν περι ων ε]πεμφθης[αν]  
 [ 2–3 ] .. ακουετε ουδε[ν ουν εξελεγχες]θαι δικαιο[.]  
 [εστ]ι[ν] ο πρεσβευτης [φ αυλον] ου[δ] ασυφορον υμ[ι]ν[ν]  
 40 συμβεβουλευκως κ[αι μη]ν περι ων προσεταιξα § 6  
 τε ειπειν η πραξαι η δια[ρ]ρηδην εψηφισαθε  
 ποιησαι προσηκει διωκηκεναι ειεν των δε  
 δη χρονων δ[ι]α τι οτι πολλακις ω ανδρες Αθηναι  
 οι συμβαινει πολλων πραγατων και μεγαλω(ν)  
 [και]ρον εν βραχει χρονω γινεσθαι ον εαν τις  
 45 [ε]κων καθυφηι τοις εναντιοις και προδω  
 ουδ αγ οτιουν ποιησγη παλιν οιος τ' εσται σω  
 και αλλα μην υπερ γε του προικα η μη το μεν § 7  
 εκ τ[ο]υτων λαμβ[ανειν] εξ ων η πολικ βλαπτε  
 ται παντε[ς] ε[ν] οιδ οτι φησαιτ αν δεινον ειαι  
 50 κ[αι] π[ο]λλης οργης αξιον ειαι ο μεντοι τον  
 [νομον τιθ]ε[ι]ς ου διωβ[ι]σε τουτο αλλ απλωσ ειπε  
 [μηδαμω]ς δωρα [λαμ]βανειν ηγουμενος εμοι  
 [.....] απαξ λα[βον]τα και διαφθαρεντα υπο

Fr. 1 recto

5 τ]αναντια τουτων pap., S<sup>d</sup> Q<sup>A</sup>: τάναντία τούτου SYU: τάναντία τούτου (with ων sscr. above ου) F

7 ανηρηκε pap. AF<sup>o</sup>U: ανήρηκεν SVY (MacDowell; cf. fr. 1 recto 27 n.).

13 εξελ[ ] pap.: εξελέγξειν SF<sup>1</sup> Q: εξελέγχειν F corr. AY.

15 αξιον [οντα τιμωρι]ας pap.: όντα τιμωρίας άξιον SVAYU: τιμωρίας όντα άξιον r and other later medieval MSS, and also Aristid. *Rh.* 37. 16 (MacDowell).

22 εμπεποιηκεν pap., conī. Markland: έμπεποιήκη S<sup>d</sup> VA: πεποιηκη S<sup>1</sup>: εμπεποιήκει YU. Pap. now gives manuscript authority to Markland's conjecture (printed by Shilleto). For the perfect indicative in a fearing clause (a fear lest something prove to be the case), cf. Thuc. 3. 53. 2, Soph. *Ai.* 278–9. Pap. here thus probably uniquely preserves the original reading.

- 22–3 δο||κει pap.: δοκεῖτ' SVAYU (δοκοῖτ' O).  
 23 [τ]ουτων SVYU; τούτου A.  
 24 τουθ' υμιν αυτοις pap.: τουθ' ὑμῖν λέξω εἰ κέψαιθε (so S corr. VY corr.: κέψαιθε S<sup>1</sup> AY<sup>1</sup> schol. 340. 14 Hermogenes *Περὶ εὐρέσεως* 3. 99 (H. Rabe, *Hermogenis Opera*, *Rhetores Graeci* vi (Leipzig 1913) 127. 13)) παρ' ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς SVAYU. Pap. omits 5 words in error (saut du même au même).  
 Nearly all the medieval MSS have ὁ ἄνδρες δικασταί, but some have merely ὁ ἄνδρες and a few late ones have ὁ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι (FkMqXd).  
 25 λογισαιθε pap., VYU: λογισαθαι S: λογισεθε A.  
 τῆι πόλει pap. SVAYU: om. Hermogenes *Περὶ εὐρέσεως* 3. 99 (127. 14 Rabe): τίνων προσήκει τῆ πόλει λόγον, Hermogenes *Περὶ ἰδεῶν* A 235. 12 Rabe (not reported by Blass, Butcher, Mathieu).  
 26 μεν pap. SFAYU: om. Q  
 τουνν pap. SVAYU Hermogenes *Περὶ εὐρέσεως* 3. 99 (127. 15 Rabe): om. Hermogenes *Περὶ ἰδεῶν* A 235. 13 Rabe.  
 27 απηγγυλεν pap., SFQAYU and printed by Fuhr. Some editors (Butcher, Dindorf) print ἀπήγγυλε.  
 δευ[τ]ερρον δε pap., SVAY Hermogenes *Περὶ εὐρέσεως* 3. 99 (127.15 Rabe): εἶτα δὲν Hermogenes *Περὶ ἰδεῶν* A 235. 13 Rabe.  
 28 μετα ταυτα pap., SVYU Hermogenes *Περὶ εὐρέσεως* 3. 99 (127. 16 Rabe): εἶτα A.  
 των χρονων pap., SF mg. Q<sup>pp</sup>YU Hermogenes: χρόνων V<sup>1</sup>: τὸν χρόνον A.  
 29–53 The line-ends are supplied by P. Lit. Lond. 126.  
 29–30 π[αν]τα ταυ]τα pap., SVYU: ταῦτα πάντα A Hermogenes *Περὶ εὐρέσεως* 3. 99 (127. 13 Rabe).  
 30 τουτων εκαστο[.] pap.: τούτων ἑκάστου AU: τούτων ἑκαστον Sd: τούτων S<sup>1</sup> VY. It is impossible to say whether pap. read εκαστο[v] or εκαστο[v]. The collocation τούτων ἑκαστ- is of course common in Demosthenes, but editors generally have rejected ἑκαστον and ἑκάστου here. As Hausmann 112 notes, pap. shows that the word, if interpolated, was an ancient interpolation.  
 31 .[. . .] pap.: om. SVAYU. Pap. evidently had c. 6 letters where the MSS have nothing to report (cf. fr. 1 verso 7, 22). The first trace is compatible with c, the second with i or the right-hand descender of n. What was contained in this lacuna remains obscure. That in the original text of Demosthenes there was an ellipse of the verb and that ὅτι began the next sentence both seem confirmed by §6 τῶν δὲ δὴ χρόνων διὰ τί; ὅτι κτλ.  
 31–2 β[ο]υλε[v]||.[. . . περ]ι pap.: βουλευεσθαι περι SVYU: βουλεύεσθαι περι A. In view of the spacing, pap. probably had β[ο]υλε[v]||ε[σθαι περι].  
 32 ορθω]ς υμιν pap. VAYU: ὑμῖν SQ<sup>pp</sup>. Bell *apud* Hausmann read ορθω]ς υμιν, Milne read πραγματω]ν υμ[ι]ν.  
 33 .[. . μ]ε]ν ουν pap.: either ε[αν μ]ε]ν ουν with A, or α[ν μ]ε]ν ουν with SVYP. The trace suggests rather ε[αν].  
 34 [2–3 δ]ε pap.: space suggests [εαν δ]ε with F<sup>1</sup> QA rather than [αν δ]ε with SFYU; and cf. 33 n.  
 37 [2–3] . c ακουετε pap.: ἀκούετε SVAYU. Pap. evidently had a sequence of 5–6 letters ending in c where the medieval MSS have nothing to report. This sequence should almost certainly be restored as [υμ]ε]ς. There is frequent disagreement in our medieval manuscripts of Dem. XIX whether ὑμεῖς is or is not to be included with a 2nd person plural verb: cf. §8 προσετάξατε ὑμεῖς (Hermogenes: προσετάξατε SVAYU), §38 ὑμεῖς ἔχοιτε (SVA<sup>2</sup> YU: ἔχοιτε A1), §84 ἐποιήσαθε ὑμεῖς (A: ἐποιήσαθε SVYU), §157 ὑμεῖς ἐοράκατε (SVAP: ἐοράκατε Y<sup>1</sup>).  
 δικαιο[.] pap.: δίκαιος SVYU: δίκαιον A.  
 39–40 ων προσεταξα]τε pap. U<sup>1</sup>: ὧν γε προσετάξατε V (MacDowell): ὧν γε προσετάξατ' S<sup>1</sup> AY: ὧν γε ἢ προσετάξατ' S corr.: ὧν ἐπέμφθησαν S<sup>d</sup> mg.: ὧν γε (?) ἐπέμφθησαν ἢ U mg.  
 40 πραξαι η pap.: πράξαι καὶ SVAYU.  
 41–2 των δε | δη χρονων pap. SVA<sup>1</sup> YU: τὸν δὲ δὴ χρόνον A corr.  
 43 μεγαλω(v): final n written as a superscript bar at line end.  
 44 εαν pap. VA: ἄν SYU.  
 45 προδω: Bell transcribed προδω[ι], but the ι was not written: προδω Milne.  
 46 εσται pap. SFAYU: ἔσται Q

ποιησι pap.: ποιήμι SVAYU. In the absence of P. Oxy., Bell and Milne naturally restored ποιήμι. The aorist subjunctive here is a viable variant to the present subjunctive.

49 παντες[ε]υ οιδ pap. VA: πάντες οἶδ' SYU. Bell and Milne assumed that pap. read παντες οιδ.

φησαιτ pap. SVYU: φήσεται' A.

δεινον ειναι pap.: εἶναι δεινόν SVAYU.

51 Either [νομον τιθ]ε[ι]ς with SVAY or [νομον θ]ε[ι]ς with U.

ειπε pap.: εἶπεν S' VAYU: ἀπέειπεν Sd<sup>pp</sup>Q<sup>pp</sup>.

52 εμοι pap.: ὡς ἐμοί SVAYU. Either ὡς omitted in error (so Hausmann 113) or pap. read δοκειν in 52–3.

53 [ . . . . . ]: pap. probably read [δοκει(ν) τον].

## Fr. 1 verso

[ . . . . . ] . . . . . [ . . . . . ] μι § 8  
 [cθo]υς [ειλ]ηφοτᾶ μετᾶ Φ[ιλοκρατους καταψηφι]  
 [cac]θε α[υτο]υ και [δ]ικην αξιαν των αδι[χ]ηματων  
 [λαβ]ετε αγ δε μη επι[δ]ε[ι]ξ[ω] ταυτᾶ [η μ]η παντ[α]  
 5 [εμε] μεν [φ]αυλον ηγεισθ[ε] τ[ο]υτ[ο]ν δε αφ.[2–3] πολλᾶ δε § 9  
 [και δειν]α κατηγορειν εχων [ε]τι προς τ[. . .] . . . . .  
 [ω] αγ[δρεc] Α[θ]ηναιοι [ 8–9 ] ουκ εσθ' οστιc  
 [ . . . ] αγ εικοτως μειησειεν αυτον βουλ[ο]μαι προ  
 παντων ων μελλω λεγειν μνημονευοντας υμ [ . . . ]  
 10 ευ οιδ ο[τι] τ[ο]υc πολλουc υμων μνημονευσαι τιγ[α]  
 ταξιν πρωτον εταξεν Αι[σ]χινης εν τη πολιτειαι  
 το πρωτον και τιναc λογουc κατᾶ του [Φιλιπ]που δη  
 μη[γο]ρειν ωieto δειν ἴν ειδη[θ] οτι τοιc υφ εα[υ]του  
 [πεπρ]α[γ]μενοιc και δεδημηγ[ο]ρημενοιc c. 3 ] . . .  
 15 [ c. 4 ] ..εξελεγθηcεται δω[ρ] εχων εστι τοι[γ]υγ § 10  
 [ουτο]c [ο] πρ[ω]τοc Αθηναιων α[ισθο]μενοc Φι[λ]ιπ  
 [πον ω]c τ[ο]τε δημηγορων εφη [επιβουλευον]τᾶ [τοι]c  
 [Ελ]λησι και διαφθειραντα [τ]ιναc των εν Α[ρ]καδιαι  
 προεcτηκοτων και εχων Ἰcχανδρον τον Νεοπτο  
 20 [λε]μου δε[υ]τ[ε]ραγωνιστην προcίωv μεν τωι δημω  
 [προ]cίωv δε τη βουληι περι τουτων και πειcαc υμαc  
 πανταχοι πρεcβειc περιπεμψαι τουc συναξον  
 τᾶc δευρο τ[ο]υc βο[υλ]ευcoμενουc περι του προc Φι  
 λιπ[πο]ν πολεμου και απαγγελων μετα ταυτᾶ  
 25 ηχ[ω]ν εξ Αρκαδια[σ] τουc καλουc εκεινουc και  
 μαχρ[ο]υc λ[ο]γουc ου[σ] εν τοιc μυριοιc εν Μεγαλη

π[ο]λεῖ προ[ο]ς Ἱερωνυμον τον υπερ Φιλίππου  
 λε[γο]ντα υπερ υμων ε[φ]η δεδημηγορηκεναῖ  
 κα[ι] δ[ι]εξιων ηλικια τηγ Ἑλλάδα πασαν ο[υ]χι τας  
 30 ἰδι[α]ς μόνον ἀδικουσι πατρι[ι]δας οἱ δωρο[δο]κουν  
 τες [κ]αῖ χρηματα λαμβανοντ[ε]ς παρα Φιλ[ι]ππου ε  
 [πει] δὴ το[ι]νυν ταυ(τα) πολ[ι]τευομενου του[του] τοτε] § 12  
 [και] τ[ο]υτο το δ[ειγμα] ε]ξενηνοχοτας πε[ρι] αυτου τους]  
 [περι της ει]ρηνη[ης c. 6 ]η[.] πεμπειν ως Φι[λιππον]  
 35 [επεις]θητε υ[π] Αριστο]δημου και Νεοπτολ[εμου]  
 [και] Κτησιφ[ωντος και] των αλλων των εξ[ειθεν]  
 [απ]αγ[γ]ελλ[οντων ουδ οτι]ουν υγιες γ[ι]νε[ται]  
 των π[ρε]σβ[ε]ων το[υτων] εις] και ουτος [[ουχ ως]]  
 ουχ ως των αποδω[ρομεν]ων τα υμετερα ο[υ]  
 40 δ [ως] των πεπιστε[υκοτων] τ]ω Φιλίππωι αλλ ως  
 των φυλαξοντων τ[ους] αλλους δια γαρ τους προ  
 ε[ι]ρημενους λογους και την προς Φιλίππον α  
 πεχ[θ]ειαν ταυτην εικοτως παντες περι αυ  
 45 τοῡ ειχ[ε]τε την δοξα[ν] προσελθων τοινυν ε  
 μοι με[τ]α ταυτα συνεταττετο κοινην πρεσβευ  
 ε[ι]ν και οπως τον μιaron [κ]αῖ κοινην φυλαξομεν  
 αμφοτεροι τον Φιλοκρατη πολλα παρεκελευ  
 50 ρατο και μεχρι του δευρ επανελθειν απο της  
 πρωτη[ς] πρεσβειας εμε γουν ω [α]νδρες Αθηναῖοι  
 διεφθ[αρ]μενος και πεπρακ[ω]ς εαυτον ελανθα  
 50 νην χωρις γαρ των αλλων ων προειρηκε[ι] προ[ο]  
 τερων αναστας τη προτεραι τη προτερα[(ι) των]  
 εκκλ[η]σιων εν ηι περι της ει[ρ]ηνης εβο[υλευ]

Fr. 1 verso

This fragment overlaps at lines 16–23 with P. Grenf. II 9, at lines 27–53 with P. Lit. Lond. 127, and at lines 49–50 with 4570 fr. 1.

4 [λαβ]ετ[ε] αν: it is not clear whether there was a high point after [λαβ]ετ[ε], or whether *αν* or *εαν* was written.

επι[δ]ε[ι]ξ[ω] pap.: δείξω SVAYU (cf. fr. 1 verso 22 περιπεμψαι pap.: πέμψαι SAYU).

5 τ[ο]υτ[ο]ν pap. SY: τουτονι AV and Hermog. 222–3 Rabe.

αφ. [2–3]: αφε[τε] (SVAYU) or αφι[ετε] (conjectured by Cobet).

6 Remains at end indeterminate.

7–8 The latter part of line 7 (with the beginning of 8) appears to have a different reading from the transmit-

ted text. Cf. fr. 1 recto 31 n. ἐξ ὧν οὐκ ἔστ' ὅστις ἄν S: οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις ἄν οὖν A (MacDowell): ἐξ ὧν ὅστις ἄν οὖν A<sup>1</sup>: οὐκ ἔσθ' add. A<sup>3</sup>mg.

9–10 *μνημονεοντας υμ[.] | - - τους πολλους υμων* pap.: *μνημονεύοντας ὑμῶν - - τοὺς πολλοὺς* SVYU: *μνημονεύοντας ὑμῶν - - πολλοὺς* A. Pap. read either (i) *μνημονεοντας υμω[v] | - - τους πολλους υμων* with ditto-graphy of *υμων*, arising perhaps due to confusion over word order, i.e. either *υμων τους πολλους* or *τους πολλους υμων*; or (ii) *μνημονεοντας υμα[ε] | - - τους πολλους υμων*, in which case the uncertainty is syntactical: either (a) *υμας τους πολλους* (*τους πολλους* in opposition to *υμας*), or (b) *τους πολλους υμων* (*υμων* partitive genitive with *πολλους*). Perhaps we have here two textual alternatives, which both found their way into the main text.

10 *ευ* pap. A: om. SVYU.

*μνημονευσαι* pap.: *ὑπομνήσαι* SVAYU. The reading of pap. is evidently inferior to that of the medieval MSS, as Demosthenes apparently does not employ *μνημονεύειν* transitively. Corruption due to preceding *μνημονεοντας* (9)?

11 *πρωτον: ἐαυτόν* SVAYU.

14–15 The expected reading would be *εν αρχη(ι) μαλιςτ(α)*, but we have failed to interpret the scanty traces as parts of this and so leave the text unrestored.

18 *διαφθειραντα: διαφθείροντα* SVAYU, P. Grenf. II 9. The papyrus' reading could be grammatically sustained.

20 *προσίων* SVAYU: *και προσίων* P. Grenf. II 9.

*δημω[ε]* is not excluded.

20–2 The papyrus has a different ordering: *προσίων μεν τωι δημω(ι) [πρ]οσίων δε τη βουλημ*, whereas SF AYU, P. Grenf. II 9 have *προσίων μεν τῇ βουλή, προσίων δε τῷ δήμω*. Cf. fr. 1 recto 15 n. Disruption in the tradition here is represented in Q, which omits *προσίων μεν τῇ βουλή*.

22 *πανταχοι* S: *πανταχοῦ* VY, P. Grenf. II 9 [Dion. Hal.], *Rhet.* 8. 6 (301 Usener–Radermacher): *πανταχῆι* A.

*περιπεμφαι* pap.: *πέμφαι* SAYU P. Grenf. II 9: *πέμπειν* V (cf. fr. 1 verso 4 n.).

22–3 *τους συναξον|τας* SAVYU: *τους αξαντας* P. Grenf. II 9.

23 *τ[ο]υς βο[υλ]ευκομενους περι* SAVYU: om. P. Grenf. II 9.

24 *απαγγελων: ἀπαγγέλλων* Fuhr.

27 A rough breathing (or slaphdash diaeresis?) above the *ι* of *ιερωνυμον*.

27–53 These lines overlap with P. Lit. Lond. 127 col. i (pag. 1).

29–53: The beginnings of these lines are supplied by P. Lit. Lond. 126.

29–31 P. Lond. contains the line beginnings: 29 *κα[ε] δ[ι]* 30 *ἰδ[ε]* 31 *τε[ε]*. These are not recorded in the transcript by Bell (apud Hausmann), and were misread and wrongly assigned to the following leaf by Milne.

30 *μόνον αδικουσι: ἀδικοῦσι μόνοι* SVAYU, P. Lit. Lond. 127.

33 *ἐξενηροχотας* pap.: *ἐξενηροχότος* SVAYU, P. Lit. Lond. 127. The papyrus' reading is not viable here.

34 We do not see how to reconcile ]η[.] with the transmitted reading *πρέβεις*.

37 *χ[ε]ν[ε]ται* with A (MacDowell): *γίγνεται* SVAYU, P. Lit. Lond. 127.

38–9 The end of 38 and the beginning of 39 (the former contained in **4569**, the latter in P. Lond.) both have *ουχ ως*. Marks over the *ο* and *γ* in 38 may have been intended as expunction marks; there also seem to be ink traces over *χ* and *ω*, although the surface has been damaged. Above *ε* the surface is missing, so it is possible that it too was similarly expunged.

42 *Φιλιππον* with V, P. Lit. Lond. 127, Dionysius Hal.: *τόν Φίλιππον* SAY.

43–4 *εικοτως παντες περι αυ|του: εικότως περι| αὐτοῦ πάντες* SVAYU: *εικοτως ταυτην περι αυτου παρ|τες* P. Lit. Lond. 127.

44 paragraphus: in P. Lond., but not reported by Bell–Hausmann–Milne.

46 *κοινη* was written instead of the transmitted *ἀναιδῆ* (*λίαν ἀναιδῆ* Dionys.), possibly influenced by the occurrence of *κοινη* in the preceding line at this point in the scribe's exemplar?

47 *Φιλοκρατη* pap.: *Φιλοκράτην* SVAYU P. Lit. Lond. 127.

51 *ὡν προειρηκε[ι]* pap. SY<sup>99</sup> P. Lit. Lond. 127: *ὦν, ὄπερ εἶπον, εἰρήκει* S corr. pr. m. F corr. AY: *ὡνπερ εἶπον εἰρήκει* S<sup>1</sup> F<sup>1</sup> Q

52–3 *τῆ προτεραι τῆ προτερα[(ι) των] | εκκλ[η]σιων*: In the absence of **4569**, Hausmann restored *τῆ προτεραι ε[κκλησια των] | εκκλ[η]σιων*; Milne restored *τῆ προτεραι τ[ων εκκλησιων?] | εκκλησιων*. The dittography is now shown to be with *προτεραι* rather than *εκκλησιων*. The medieval manuscripts are divided here between *τῆ προτεραίαι τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν* SVY, P. Lit. Lond. 127: *τῆ προτέρα ἐκκλησία* A. In view of Dem. 19. 15 *τῆ προτεραίαι . . . εἰς τὴν ὑστεραίαν, τῆ προτεραίαι* would have a fair claim to be the right reading (*pace* Hausmann 114). See R. Shilleto, *Demosthenis De falsa legatione*, 4th edn (Cambridge 1874) 17–18. However, at Dem. 19. 144 we find *τὴν προτέραν ἡμέραν* with *εἰς τὴν ὑστεραίαν*, and Shilleto op. cit. supposes that *τῆ προτεραίαι τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν* would have to mean not ‘on the first day of the assemblies’, but ‘on the day before the assemblies’.

53 *ἡ: αἰς* SVAYU. Possibly pap. alone preserves the correct reading here. The *ἐκκλησίαι* lasted two consecutive days (18th and 19th Elaphebolion), hence *ἡ προτεραία / προτέρα* and *ἡ ὑστεραία*. On the first of these days, they *deliberated* about the peace (*ἐν ἡί περι τῆς εἰρήνης ἐβουλευέσθε*), but the actual decision on *ratification* of the peace was postponed until the second day, §15 *ἐν ἡί τὴν εἰρήνην ἔδει κυροῦσθαι* (cf. § 144). *Pace* Hausmann 114 (arguing for the correctness of *ἐν αἰς*: ‘in utraque enim contione Athenienses de pace deliberavisse ex orationis ipsius verbis elucet’).

## Fr. 2 recto

- ληθξς ιχχ[υρον και τουναντιον αθενες το συν] § 208  
 ε[ιδ]ξναι π[επρακοςιν αυτοις τα πραγματα τουτο]  
 παραιτε[ιται την θραυτητα την τουτων] τ[ουτ] αποξ[τρεφει]  
 [τ]ην γλωττα[ν εμφραττει το στομα] αγ[χ]ει σιωπαν ποιει  
 5 [το] τ[οι]υ[ν] τελευταιον ιστε δηπου πρω]ην εν Πειραιει οτε αυ § 209  
 [τον ουκ ειατε πρεσβευειν βοων]τα ως [εισαγγ]ελεί με και  
 [γραψεται και ιου ιου καιτοι ταυτα μ]εν εστιν μ[α]κρων και  
 [πολλων αγωνων και λογων αρχη] εκεινα δε απλα κα[ι]  
 [δυο η τρια ιως ρηματα α] κ[αν ε]χθες εωνη[μ]ενος αν[θρω]  
 10 [πος ειπειν ηδυνηθη ανδρες Αθ]ηηαιρι τ[ουτ]ι το π[ραγ]  
 [μα πανδεινον εστι ου]τ[ο] [κι] κα[τ]ηγορει ταυτα εμου ων  
 [αυτος κοινωνος γεγνε κ]αι χρηματα ειληφεναι φη[σιν]  
 [εμε αυτος το]υτ[ων] μεν τ[ο]ινυν ουδεν ειπ[εν]  
 [ουδε εφθεγξατο ουδε ηκουσεν υ]μων ουδεις αλλα δε ηπε[ι]  
 15 [λει δια τι οτι ταυτα μεν αυτω σ]υνηδε[ι] πεπραγμ[ενα και]  
 [δουλος ην των ρημα]των τ[ουτων] ουκουν πρ[ο]σ[η]ι προς  
 [ταυτα η διανοια αλλα] αν[ε]δυετο επελαμ[βανετο γαρ αυ]  
 [της το συνει]δ[εναι λουδορεια]ι δε αλλ . . . ουδ[εν]  
 [εκωλυεν αυτο]ν ουδ[ε] βλασφημ[ε]ν[ε]ν ο τ[ο]ινυν μεγα[ισ]τον § 211  
 20 [απαντων κα]ι ου λοχ[ος α]λλ[ε] [εργον] βουλομεν[ο]ν γαρ εμ[ου]  
 [τα δικαγια] ως περ επρεξ[βευσα] δικ ουτω] και λογον υμι[ν] δου]



- [ναι δις] προσελθ[ων Αισχίνης ουτοςι] τοις λογιστα[ις εχων]  
 [μα]ρτ[υρ]ας πολλ[ους απηγορευε μ]η καλειν εμε ει[ς το]  
 [δι]καστηριον τι ουν ην [τουτο της προτερας εκεινης]  
 25 [πρε]σβειας ης ουδεις κ[ατηγορει δους] λοχ[ον ουκετι εβου]  
 [λε]το αυθις ειξιεναι πε[ρι ταυτης ης] νυ[ν ει]σερχ[εται]  
 [εν η] παντα τα αδικημα[τα ενη]ν [εκ] δε του δις ε[μ εις] § 212  
 [ελθει]ν αναγκη περιεσ[τατο κ]αι τουτωι παλιν [εισιε]  
 [ναι δια] ταυτα ουκ εια με κ[αλ]ε[ιν] και τοι τουτο το [εργον]  
 30 [ω αν]δρες Αθηναιοι αμφ[ο]τε[ρα υμι]ν επιδεικ[νυσιν σα]  
 [φως και] κατεγνωκοτα εα[υτ]ου τουτοη ωστε μηδενι νυν  
 [υμων] ευσεβως εχειν [α]ποψηφισασθαι αυτ[ου και]  
 [μηδεν] αλεθες ερουντ[α περι εμου ει γ]αρ ειχε τ[οτε αν]  
 [και λεγων κ]αι κατηγορων [ε]ξ[ητα]ζετο ου μα Δ[ι]α ουκ απη)  
 35 [γορε]υε καλειν ως τοι νυ[ν ταυ]τα αλη[θη λεγω καλει] § 213  
 [μ]οι [τ]ουτων τους μαρ[τ]υρας [ vac. ]  
 [α]λλα μην εαν [γε τι εξω της πρεσβεια]ς βλα[ς]φη[μην]  
 [π]ερι ε[μ]ο[υ] κατα πολλα ουκ αν εικ[ο]σως ακουοιτε α[υ]  
 [τ]ου [ου γαρ εγω κρινομαι τημερον] ουδ' εγχει μετα [ταυ]  
 40 τα υ[δωρ ουδεις εμοι τι ουν εστι τ]αυτα πλην δικαιων  
 λογων [απορια τις γαρ αν κατηγο]ρειν ελοιτο κρινομε  
 νος εχ[ων ο τι απολογησεται ετι] το[ι]νυν κακεινο ςκο  
 πειτ[ε ανδρες δικασται ει εκρ]ινομη[ν] μ[ε]ν εχω κατη  
 45 γ[ο]ρε[ι] δε Αισχ[ινης ουτοςι Φιλι]ππος δ ην ο κρινων  
 ειτ' εγω μηδεν [ε]χ[ων ειπειν ως ουκ α]δικω κακως  
 ελεγον τουτονι κ[αι προπηλακιζειν] επεχειρουν  
 ουκ αν οιεσθε κ[αι κατα αυτο τουτο αγανα]κτη[σαι] το[ν]  
 Φιλιπ[ο]ν ει πα[ρα εκεινωι τους ε]κεινον [τις ευεργε]  
 50 τας ει κακως λεγει μ[η τοι νυν υμεις χειρους γε]  
 νησθε Φιλιππου αλλ' υπ[ερ ων αγωνιζεται περι του]  
 51a των ανακαζετε απολ[ο]γ[εισθαι λεγε την μαρτυριαν]  
 51b >— [
- ουκουν εχω μεν εκ τ[ο]ν μ[ηδεν εμαυτω συνειδεναι]  
 και λ[ο]γον διδ[ο]ναι και παντ[α τα εκ των νομων υπε]  
 55 χειν ωμοσην [ο]υτος δε [ε] τ[α]ναντια πως ουν ταυτα ε]  
 μοι και τουτωι πε[π]ρακ[ται η πως ενεστι τουτωι ταυ]

τα προς υμας λεγειν α μη[δε ητιαται προτερον πωποτε ουδαμωσ]  
 δηπου αλλ ομωσ ερει κ[αι νη Δια εικοτωσ γε ιστε γαρ δ]η  
 που τουθ' οτι αφ ου γεγον[ασι ανθρωποι και κρις]εισ γι  
 γνονται ουδεις πωποτε [ομολογων αδικειν ε]αλω αλλα  
 60 αναισχυντουσιν αρνου[νται ψευδονται πρ]οφρασεισ [π]λατ  
 τονται πα[ντ]α ποιουσιν υπ[ερ του μη δουναι δ]ικη[ν] εφ ων § 216  
 [ο]υδενος δει τημερον υμα[ς] π[αρακρουσθηναι] αλλ αφ ων

Fr. 2 recto

1–3 The right-hand portion of these lines is severely abraded. The transcript ignores scattered specks of ink that cannot be assigned to particular letters.

3 *απορ[τρεφει]* VAP: *ἀποστρέφεται* SY.

7 Spacing suggests that the papyrus may have read *και ιου ιου* with SVAYP after *γραφεται*, rather than *ιου ιου* with O.

13 The codex did not have room before *το]υτ[ων* for both *ειληφώς η̄* and *μετεληφώς. η̄ μετεληφώς* is omitted by B, usually explained as by parablepsy, though some editors maintain it as the original reading: G. H. Schaefer (followed by Fuhr) excised *ειληφώς η̄*, Reiske *η̄ μετεληφώς*. For discussion see Shilleto ad loc. The papyrus does not help to solve the controversy. Possibly a supralinear addition (*]ωσ?*) above *μ* of *μεγ*.

*ειπ[εν]* SVAYP: *είπεν* secl. Weidner.

17 *επελαμ[βανετο]* SVAYP: *ελαμβάνετο* S<sup>sup</sup>.

18 *λοιδορευθαι]ι δε αλλ. . ουδ[εν]*: SVYP have *λοιδορείσθαι δ' ἄλλ' ἄττ'*: A omits *ἄλλ'*. *οὐδὲν* is a conjecture (mg. Morelij): *οὐδεις* SVAYP, but the papyrus does not reveal its reading here.

24 After *[δι]καστηριον* the papyrus has omitted *ώς δεδωκότ' εὐθύνας καὶ οὐκ ὄνθ' ὑπεύθυνον καὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα ἦν ὑπεργέλοιον*.

28 *περιε[στατο: περιίστατο]* SAVYP. Or did the papyrus have *περιε[στατο?*

29 *ταυτα* with F: *ταὐτ'* SY (MacDowell): *τούτο* QAP. *με* is an original variant after *οὐκ εἶα*.

31 *κατεγνωκοτα* with AFQP: *κατεγνωκόθ'* SY (MacDowell).

*εα[ντ]ον* SVYP: *αὐτοῦ* A.

33 I. *αληθεσ*.

35 *καλειν* SVAYP: *μη̄* ante *καλεῖν* add. Cobet.

36 Titulum MAPTYPEC post *μάρτυρας* add. SVAYP del. Felicianus. The scribe must have left the remainder of the line space blank, beginning the next section at the start of a new line. The blank space is anomalous, as it cannot have been left to contain a rubric like *μαρτυρες* or *μαρτυρια*.

37 *εαν* VP: *ἄν* SAY.

42–3 *κακεινο κκο]πειτ[ε]* SVYP: *σκοπεῖτε κάκεινο* A.

43 *δικασται* SVAY: om. P.

43–5 *κατη]γ[ο]ρη[ει] . . . εγω* SVAYP: om. P<sup>1</sup>.

49 *τας ει*. Initial ink traces show interference by apparently extraneous ink. Possibly a pleonastic anaphoric *ει* stood after *τας*. SVAYP read unproblematically *εὐεργέτας κακῶσ*.

*λεγει* SVYP<sup>1</sup>: *λέγοι* AP<sup>4</sup>.

49–50 *γε]νησθε* SVAYP: *γενεσθαι* S<sup>1</sup>.

51a *αναγκ]αζετε* SVAYP: *αναγκάζεται* S<sup>1</sup>: *ἀναγκάζετε αὐτὸν* A.

51b A forked paragraphus marks the *μαρτύρια*. Possibly the rubric was written out at this level. If so, it was written off-centre to the right, and is now lost. MAPTYPIAI S.

52 *μεν* VAP: om. SY Bekk. anecd. 171, 14.

*συνειδεναι]* SAY: *συνειδέναι δεινὸν* VP.

53 ἤθελον added after λόγον in A.

54 ωμοροσην: ὤμην δεῖν SVAYP.

[ο]υτος SAY: οὐτοςι VP.

56 προτερον SVYP: om. A. With 49 letters this line is remarkably longer than average. It is likely that προτερον has dropped out.

61 εφ ων. No variant from transmitted ὦν is elsewhere recorded. Possible trace of a high stop preceding εφ.

62 [ο]υδενος: οὐδενι SVAYP. The papyrus' reading is ungrammatical, probably a careless error. The papyrus also exhibits a unique order here: [ο]υδενος δει τημερον ὑμας παρακρουσθηναι, whereas SVAYP have οὐδενι δει παρακρουσθηναι τήμερον ὑμάς.

## Fr. 2 verso

- [ιςτ]ε αυτοι τα π[ρ]αγματα κ[ρ]ιναι μη τοις εμοις λ[ο]γοις μ[η] § 216  
 [δε τ]ο[ι]ς τουτ[ο]υ προ[ο]ς εχειν [μηδε γε τοις μα]ρτυσειν ους  
 [ουτ]ο[ς] ετ[οι]μους εξει μαρτυ[ρειν οτιου]ν Φ[ι]λιππω[ι]  
 χορηγωι χρωμενος οψεσ[θε δε ως ετο]ιμωσ αυτω[ι]  
 5 μαρτυρησουσιν μηδε γε [ει καλον και] μεγα ουτ[ο]ς φθ[ε]ν  
 ξεται μηδ ει φαυλον εγω [ουδε γαρ ρητορων ουδε λο] § 217  
 γων. [υμας] κρισιν τημερο[ν ειπερ ευ φρονειτε προση]  
 κει[ι] ποιεισθαι αλλ υπε[ρ] πραγματων αιςχρωσ και  
 δευωσ απολωλοτων τη[ν] υ[παρ]χουσιν αιςχυνην  
 10 εις τους αιτιους απωσασ[θαι τα πεπραγμενα α παν]  
 τεσ επισταςθε εξετ[ασαντας τι ουν εστι ταυθ]  
 α υμεις ιστε και [ου] παρ[α] ημων υμας ακουσαι δει ει § 218  
 μ[ε]ν απαντα. [ο]σα υπεσχο[ν] υμιν εκ της ειρηνης  
 γεγονεν και τσαυτης [ανανδριας και κακιας]  
 15 [υ]μεις ομολογησα. [ε]ιναι μεστοι ωστε μητ εν τηι  
 [χ]ωραι των πολεμι[ων οντων μητε εκ θαλαττης]  
 [πολ]ιορκουμενοι μη[τε εν αλλω μηδενι δεινω της]  
 πολεωσ ουσης αλλα και [ι]σιτον ευωνον ωνουμε  
 υ[ο]ι και ταλλα ουδεν [χ]ει[ρον] π[ρα]ττοντες η νυν προ] § 219  
 20 ε[ι]δ[οτ]εσ και προακ[η]κο[οτ]ε[ς] παρα τουτων και  
 [τ]ο[υ]ς συμμαχ[ο]υσ απ[ο]λουμε[ν]υ[ο]ς και Θηβαιουσ ιςχυ  
 ρουσ γενησο[με]νυ[ο]ς και τα επι Θρα[κη]ς Φιλιππον]  
 [λ]ηψο[με]νον και ε[ν] Ευβοια κατασκε[υ]α[ς] [θη]ς[ο]μενα  
 [ορμητηρι]α εφ υμας [και πανθ α π]επρακται γε[ν]η  
 25 [σο]μενα ειτ[α] την ειρηνη[ην εποιησα]σθε αγ[α]πητ[ω]ς  
 [απο]ψηφι[ς] α[ς]θε Αιςχι[νου και μη προ]ς [ο]υτοισ α[ι]ς  
 [χρ]οισ και επιορκια[ν] [πρ]οσκη[σθε] ου γαρ υμ[α]ς

[αδικει] ἀλλ ἐγὼ μαι[νο]μαι καὶ τ[ε]τυφωμα[ι νυν]  
 [κατ]ηγγορων ἀ[υ]του εἰ δὲ [παντα τα]ναντία τ[ουτων] § 220  
 30 [καὶ] πολλὰ φιλα[ν]θρώπων ἐ[ιποντες] Φίλιππον [φιλεῖν]  
 [την] πόλιν Φωκέας ὡς[ε]ῖν Θηβαίους παν[ε]ῖν  
 [της υ]βρῆως ἐτι πρὸς τ[ουτοις μειζο]ν ἢ κα[τα] Ἀμφί  
 [πολιν] ἐν ποιήσειεν υμ[α]ς Ἐυβοίαν ὦρον [αποδώσειν]  
 [εἰαν τυχη]ῖ της εἰρη[νης εἰ ταυ]τὰ ἐ[ιποντες καὶ ]  
 35 [υποσχομενοι παντα ἐξηπατ]ηκᾶσι κ[αὶ πέφε]  
 ν[α]κῆκα[σιν καὶ μονον οὐ την] Ἀτ[τικὴν] υμ[ων]  
 περιρη[ν]ται [καταψηφισας]θῆ καὶ μῆ [προς]  
 τοῖς ἀλλοῖς οἰς [υβριθε οὐ γὰρ ἐγωγ οἶδ ο τι χρῆ] λῆ  
 γειν ἀλλο καὶ ὑπ[ερ] ὧν οὗτοι δεδωροδοκ]ηκα[σιν]  
 40 ὑμεῖς τὴν ἀραν [καὶ τὴν ἐπιόρκιαν οἰ]κάδε εἰς  
 ἐνεγκησθε ἐ[τι τοῖνυν κακεῖνο σκο]πείτ[ω] § 221  
 ἀν[δ]ρ[ε]ς[τ] δικαστᾶ[ι τινος εἰνεκα ἐγὼ μῆδε]ν ἠδ[ε]ῖ  
 κηκ[ο]τ[ων] του[των] κατηγορεῖν ἀ[ν] προ[ε]ίλ[ο]μην  
 οὐ γὰρ ἐ[υρη]ς[ετε] ἠδὲ πολλοὺς ἐ[χθροὺς] ἐχειν οὐ  
 45 δὲ γ' ἀ[σφαλές] ἀλλὰ ὑπερ]χῆ μοι πρὸς τοῦτον  
 [ἀ]πεχθ[ε]ῖα τ[ι]ς οὐδεμία τι οὐν ἐ]φοβ[ο]ν περὶ σου  
 [καὶ] δ[ι]α δ[ε]ῖ[λιαν] ταυτην ἡγῆς]ω ζώτῃριαν καὶ  
 [γὰρ ταυτα ἀκηκοα]υτ[ον] [λεγε]ῖν [κ]αι[τοῖ] [μῆ]δενος  
 [γε οντος] Αἰσχίνῃ δεινοῦ μῆδε ἀδι]κημ[ατο]ς ὡς  
 50 [συ φησ] εἰ γὰρ αὐ ταυτ ἐρεῖ σκοπεῖτε ἀ]νδρ[ε]ς δι]καστᾶ[ι]  
 [εἰ ἐφ] οἰς ο μῆδ οτιοῦν ἀδικῶν] ἐφοβ[ο]μένην ἐγὼ μ[η]  
 [διὰ] τοῦτους ἀπολωμαὶ τι τοῦτους] προ]σηκε[ι] π[α]θ[ε]ιν § 222  
 [τοὺς] αὐτοὺς ἡδίκηκο]τᾶ[ς] ἀλλ' οὐ δὲ]α τᾶ[ν]τᾶ ἀλλὰ  
 [διὰ] τὴν σου κατηγορῶ]ν κ[ο]φαντῶ νῆ Δία ἵνα ἀρχ[ῆ]  
 55 [ριον] λαβῶ παρα σου καὶ] προτ[ε]ρον ἢ μοι κρειττ[ον]  
 π[α]ρα Φιλίππου λαβείν] το[ν] διδ[οντος] πολὺ καὶ μῆ  
 [δενος] τοῦτων ἐλαττο]ν κ[αὶ] φίλ]ον κακεῖνον ἐχ[ε]ῖν  
 κ[αὶ] τ[ουτους] ἦσαν γὰρ ἀν ἡσ]αν φίλοι των αὐτῶ[ν]  
 60 ἐκ[ο]ινῶ[ν] ἡκοτι οὐδε γὰρ ν]ν ἐχθ[ρ]αν πατρικ[ῆ]ν  
 ἐχο[ν]τι πρὸς [μῆ] ἀλλὰ [οτι] τ[ων] π[ε]ρ[ρ]α[γμ]εν[ων]

Fr. 2 verso

2 οὐκ VAP: οἰς SY.



Fr. 3 verso

	·	·	·	·	
	[.]...[	].	[	φν]	§ 314
	ζων [τ]ων Φιλίπ[π]ον [				
	..[...].	.....	[		
	βουλομενων και κλυδ[ωνα και μανιαν τα κα]				
5	θε[ς]τ[η]ς[ο]τα πραγματα [				
	προς[κ]υνων την θ[ολον]				§ 315
	επ[α]νελεθειν [				
	....[...].	α.	[		
	[.].. [				
10	[.].. [				
	·	·	·	·	

Fr. 3 verso

7 επ[α]νελεθειν with VAP<sup>1</sup>: επελεθειν SQ<sup>7</sup>YP<sup>7</sup> and adopted by Fuhr.

B. CURRIE  
B. GRAZIOSI  
J. HORDERN  
A. NODAR  
T. SCHELZIUS

**4570.** DEMOSTHENES, XIX 13, 17, 155–6

88/264

5 × 10 cm (fr. 3)

Third century

Parts of at least two non-consecutive columns written along the fibres of a papyrus roll. The back is blank. A kollesis is visible at the left edge of fr. 2 b. The script is an irregular version of the Severe Style, to be assigned to the third century AD by comparison with Turner, *GMAW*<sup>2</sup> 49 (Apoll. Rhod., iii assigned). Notable is the vertical extension of letters, tendency toward connection, some serifs (ι, τ). The pointed centre of the four-stroke μ reaches nearly to the bottom, giving a more simple, earlier appearance than some third-century bookhands. Other comparable hands are XXXI **2538** (plates VI–VII) and LII **3656** (plate I). Column height cannot be determined: neither top nor bottom margins are in evidence. The average width of the columns is approximately 5.5 cm, with lines of 15–24 letters. The scribe writes iota adscript twice (fr. 3. 1, 9), and omits it in fr. 3. 6 (where it is added suprascript, possibly by a later hand) and 13. A presumption that the scribe effects elision tacitly is created by instances at fr. 2. 19, 20, 22, though he inconsistently writes *scriptio plena* in fr. 2. 14 (cf. fr. 3. 4). Punctuation, made by the same hand, includes high points in fr. 2. 18 and fr. 3. 4, possibly also the unusual ticks above the letters to indicate pauses in fr. 3.

1,9, which were however added after writing. No other lectional signs appear. Corrections, apparently made by the same hand, include deletions in fr. 2. 22 and fr. 3. 2. The text agrees in different places with different branches of the medieval tradition.

Fr. 1

. . . . .  
 ] πρωτ[ης πρεσβειας § 13  
 εμ]ε γουν ω α[νδρες  
 Αθηναι]οι διεφθα[ρμενος και  
 πεπρα]κως ε[αυτον  
 . . . . .

The lateral position of the fragment in the column is indeterminate. These lines overlap with **4569** and P. Lit. Lond. 126 and P. Lit. Lond. 127 col. i (pag. 1).

2–3 ω α[νδρες Αθηναι]οι pap., SAVYU, **4569** fr. 1 verso: ω with ϑ written above in P. Lit. Lond. 127 (cf. K. McNamee, *Abbreviations* 113).

4 ε[αυτον SAVYU: άυτ[ον P. Lit. Lond. 127.

Fr. 2 a + b

. . . . .  
 [σαντων υμων ε]πι του[ς] § 17  
 [ορκους αυτο]ν παλιν του[ς]  
 [τε χρονους] κατετ[ρι]ψ[ε]  
 [και τα πραγ]ματα [παντα]  
 5 [ελυμνηατ]ο τα τ[ης πολε]  
 [ως και οσα]ι περι τ[ουτων]  
 [εμοι προ]ς τουτ[ον απεχ]

(4 lines missing)

[ . ] . [ . ]  
 [ειν αι νυν ε]υθυ[ναι ουτε]  
 μ[ικρον ο]υ[τ]ε μεγα ο[υδ ο]  
 15 τίου[ν] ξυρημενοι τω[ν]  
 οτε την ειρηνην [εποι]  
 ειθε λεχθεντων κα[ι]  
 προσδοκηθεντων· α[λ]  
 λα παντ εξηπατημε  
 20 νοι και του[τ]ω]ν ξερε αυ

θις αυ πεπ[ραχοτων και]  
 [π]αρ α[[το]]υ[το το ψηφισμα]

Lines 1–13 overlap with P. Lit. Lond. 127 col. iii (pag. 2).

5–6 τα τ[ης πολε]ωσ pap. VA: τ[ης πό]λεωσ SY and (to judge from spacing) P. Lit. Lond. 127, and printed by Fuhr. Weil bracketed τὰ τῆς πόλεως as an interpolation, but in support Fuhr compares 207 τὰ πράγματα τῆς πόλεως. The papyrus provides ancient testimony for the reading with the article τὰ here.

12 Tail of a descender, as from ρ, Υ, Φ, Ψ, possibly compatible with ο]ρ[κους as transmitted.

19–20 ἐξηπατημενοι pap., VAY and corrected in S, and printed by Fuhr: ἐξαπατηθέντων S<sup>1</sup> corr. S<sup>dyr</sup>.

22 [π]αρα του[το pap. before correction, [π]αρ αυ[το after correction: αὐτὸ omitted in V, probably unrelated to the correction here in the papyrus. το is deleted by placing two dots above it and a horizontal stroke (m. 2? paler ink anyway) through the letters, a different method of deletion from that in fr. 3 where a series of linked horizontal lines is used.

## Fr. 3

[πορ]ευσ[τ]ο κυκλωί κ[αι πριν] § 155  
 [εις M]ακεδονιαν [[εις]]ελθ[ειν]  
 [τρεις] κα[ι ει]κοςιν ημερ[ας]  
 [ανηλ]ωσαμεν· τας δ [αλ]  
 5 [λας πα]ζας εκαθημεθ [ειν]  
 [Iελλ]ηί πριν Φιλιππον  
 [ελθε]ιν συν αις επορευθη  
 [με]ν ομου πεντηκον  
 [θ ολ]αί εν δε τουτωι Δο § 156  
 10 [ρικκ]ον Θρακ[.]. τα επι τει  
 [χων] Iερον ορος παντα τα  
 [πραγ]ματα εν ειρηνηι [και]  
 [σπον]δαις η[ι]ρηι και διωκει  
 [θ ο Φιλι]π[πος πο]λλα λεγον  
 15 [τος εμου και θρυλ]ορντ[ος]

These lines overlap with **4577** cols. i–ii.

1 Unexplained ink in the form of an acute accent above the line after ι in κυκλωι, presumably indicating a pause before the following clause (similar one in g).

2 εις deleted with a line at mid-height and a supralinear line. ειςελθειν here would be unique.

3 ει]κοςιν pap. SVAY: εἴκοσι A<sup>1</sup>.

4 δ' L: δὲ SAFQYP (MacDowell).

5 πα]ζας pap. SA: ἀπάσας VY.



εκαθημεθ[ pap.: καθήμεθ' SAFQYP and printed by Fuhr. The imperfect here is unique but sustainable as a reading in the context.

9 ολ]αc pap. SVAY: δλαιc S corr. rec. Y corr. There is unrelated ink in the shape of an acute accent after [ολ]αc, probably marking pause (cf. 1 n.).

9–10 Δο[ρικκ]ον pap. SFAY: δωρίκκον Q

10 Θρακ[.]. does not help to corroborate Θράκην (SVAY) against Palmerius' correction Θράκης (*Εργίεκην* Sandys).

13–14 SVYP have διωκεῖθ' ὁ Φίλιππος: διωκεῖτο Φίλιππος A, **4577**; but the papyrus does not reveal its reading here.

15 ἐμοῦ is printed by Fuhr; in agreement with SVAY, **4577**. Spacing leaves it uncertain whether the papyrus agreed or read μου with F<sup>1</sup>QA.

M. POWERS

### 4571. DEMOSTHENES, XIX 50–1

32 4B.7/H (2) part

3.8 × 7.9 cm

Third century

Fifteen lines from the right-hand side of a column, lacking a few letters at the end of several of the lines. Of the right margin 0.3 cm is extant (from 7 onwards). The text is written along the fibres and the back is blank.

Line length is calculated at 22–26 letters. This gives a relatively wide column for oratory of c. 7 cm (for parallels see **4578** and introd.). Too little survives to determine whether reading marks were used and how elision was treated.

The hand is clumsy and almost upright with medium-sized letters. There is a slight tendency to decoration by means of serifs facing left, attached to the vertical of κ and to the tall letters. The hand may be assigned on palaeographical grounds to the third century. Comparable are P. Berol. inv. 21102+17153 (plate 59 in *Festschrift zum 150jährigen Bestehen der Berliner Ägyptischen Museums*, Berlin 1925) which on the recto preserves accounts assignable to the reign of Trajan or Hadrian; P. Berol. inv. 21135, clumsier though (plate 58 in *Fest. Aeg. Mus. Berl.*), with cursive script on its recto assigned to the late second or early third century; PSI XI 1187 (plate XLIV in Pap. Flor. XXX) from Oxyrhynchus, assigned to the second century; with slightly later features, P. Vindob. G 29826 (plate 47 in Seider, *Paläographie* ii) assigned to the third century.

The papyrus agrees in 11 with SA against the vulgate, and with the other main MSS in 4 against A in a case of simple transposition of words. The addition of the article before Φω]κεαc, if correct, would offer a unique but significant variant.

The text of this papyrus overlaps with no other previously published. The exact division of the first six lines, where both beginnings and ends are missing, is uncertain.

· · · · ·  
 [νος δ αλλου παρον]τος των Αμ[φι] § 50  
 [κτυονων πλην Θεττ]αλων και Θ[η]  
 [βαιων ευφημοτα]τ ανθρωπω[ν του]

[τοις παραδου]ναι γεγραφε[ν το]  
 5 [ιερον γραφας τοις] Αμφικτυο[σιν]  
 [παραδουναι ποιο]ις· ου γαρ ησα[ν αυ]  
 [τοθι πλην Θηβ]αιοι και Θετ[ταλ]οι  
 [αλλ ου συγκαλεσαι δε] τους Αμφ[ι]  
 [κτυονας ουδ επισ]χειν εως αν  
 10 [συλλεγωσιν ουδε βο]ηθειν Προ  
 [ξενον εις . . . Φω]κεας ουδ ε  
 [ξιεναι Αθηναιου]ς ουδε τοιου  
 [τ ουδεν καιτοι κα]ι επιστολας § 51  
 [επεμψ ο Φιλιππος δυο καλο]υ[σας]  
 15 [υμας ουχ ιω εξελθητε] πω[μαλα]

1 Apparently *παρον*]τορς with SVY [and U?]: -των A excluded by the traces.

4 *παραδου*]ναι γεγραφε[ν: with SVY [and U?]: γέγραφε παραδούσαι A.

8 *ου συγκαλεσαι δε*]ε (suggested by space) with SA: οὐδὲ συγκαλέσαι (without δέ) VY [and U?]: ἔδει before τοὺς added by S<sup>d</sup> F mg. Q<sup>o</sup>. The last two are here ruled out by ]ε.

11 The reconstructed line is unexpectedly shorter than the rest. Restoring the article *τους* before *Φω*]κεας is attractive, though this reading is represented nowhere in the MS tradition. A similar case is found in §30: τῆς Φωκέων SAY: τῆς τῶν Φωκέων P. Lit. Lond. 127, V.

12–13 *τοιου*]τ: τούτων Mathieu.

14 The trace is compatible with part of the vertical of γ.

R. HATZILAMBROU

#### 4572. DEMOSTHENES, XIX 79–80

30 4B.41/B(1–4)a

4.5 × 6 cm

Second or third century

Fragment with 13 lines from a single column written along the fibres of a papyrus roll; no margins are visible, although the last letters of some lines are preserved (as confirmed by the space at the end of 10). There is a kollesis running vertically down the text. The back is blank. The script is a neat and well spaced hand of the ‘Severe Style’, with γ descending and with a slight leftward curve at bottom, to be assigned to the second or third century AD by comparison with XVII **2098**, Herodotus VII = Roberts, *GLH* 19c. For a second-century comparison see P. Palau Rib. 50 (lam. VII) of 175. A calligraphic copy, penned with more than usual care.

The line length is 13–15 letters. The text shows frequent use of punctuation. The scribe leaves a short space after each point of punctuation.

*Scriptio plena* is found in 8 and 9 where we might have expected elision. There are no other instances to indicate if the scribe did so consistently elsewhere. The papyrus is noteworthy in that wherever we can tell, in cases of variance, the papyrus sides with MS A, a phenomenon observed elsewhere in certain papyri of Demosthenes (see introduction). This at least proves the antiquity of those variants, and may suggest as much for the entire tradition of A; cf. MacDowell *Demosthenes: Against Meidias* 49–50.

	αδικ]ησαι [ετι τοι]	§ 79
	[νυν] και τοιφ[υτο τι]	§ 80
	[μελλ]ειν αυτον ακ[ου]	
	[ω λ]εγειν· οτι θανμ[α]	
5	[ζει τι] δηποτε Δη	
	[μοσθ]ενης μεν αυ	
	[του κ]ατηγορει· Φω	
	[κεω]ν δε ουδε εις· ως	
	[δη] τουτο εχει βελτξ[ι]	
10	[ον] προακουσαι πα	
	[ρ εμ]ου· Φωκεων τω[ν]	
	[εκπεπτω]κοτ[ων] οι	
	]. . [	

2 και with VAY: om. S, adopted by Fuhr.

6 μεν: with A alone, omitted by SVY, which Fuhr follows.

8 ουδε εις: again with A alone: οὐδέϊς SVFY: οὐδ' εἰς F<sup>1</sup>.

9 The papyrus leaves it uncertain whether it read δὴ with SY, adopted by Fuhr (whom we follow above), or δέ with VA.

The trace at the end of the line is the back of a rounded letter, hence the iotacistic orthography must have been written.

11–12 Probably the ν was squeezed in at the end of the line, though it will be longer than 10. Already the scribe begins to shorten by writing ω small and high. It is less likely to have been carried over to the beginning of 12, so as to cohere syllabically (rather than lexically) with ἐκπεπτωκότων.

13 Second trace compatible with β, most likely β[έλιςτοι.

## 4573. DEMOSTHENES, XIX 92–3

66 6B.4/F(1–2)b

8.1 × 9.3 cm

Second century  
Plate II

The damaged remains of two columns from a roll (blank verso), possibly with parts of the lower margin (no trace of ink visible below col. i 15). Together the columns contain parts of §92 (i) and §93 (ii); apart from a minor variation of word order in col. ii 1–3 and (probably) a corruption in col. ii 14 (see notes), the text agrees with the manuscript tradition (col. ii 6 and 12 n.) against conjectures of Ortner (col. ii 2–3 n.) and Herwerden (col. ii 7–8 n.).

The number of lines per column may be calculated as an average of 28 (height: c. 16 cm) with 13 letters per line (width: c. 5 cm; for similar narrow columns cf. Dem. XIX 53–7 in IX **1182** = Pack<sup>2</sup> 295, plate in *GMAW*<sup>2</sup> 67; [Dem.] XLVI 25–6 in P. Vindob. G 29824 = Pack<sup>2</sup> 330). No punctuation, accents or other diacritical signs (but see col. i 8; col. ii 3, 8) apart from four line-fillers.

The elegant upright hand has ε θ ο c tall and narrow in contrast with deliberately spaced letters like η μ ν τ; γ in particular is distinctive for its broad shallow top. There are occasional delicate serifs and finials. This style, exemplified for example in LXIV **4405** (plates I, II) + XXXIV **2683** (plates I, IV), XXXIII **2663** (plate IV) and P. Ant. I 26 (plate II), is normally assigned to the later second century; see XXVII **2454** introd. There are a few cases of ligature (col. ii 5 γο, 8 τη, 14 γη).

Col. i

	. . . .	
	[λεμος] προς Φ[ι]	§ 92
	[λιππον η]ν εν	
	[ταυθ εγκαλ]ει τις	
	[Αισχινη βο]υλε >	
5	[ται τις τουτ]ου κα >	
	[τηγορειω] περι >	
	[των εν τω π]ολε	
	[μω πραχθε]ντων	
	[ουδε εις ουκου]ν πε	
10	[ρι τουτων γ] αφξει	
	[ται και ουδεν] αυ	
	[τον δει λεγει]ν πε	
	[ρι γαρ των αμ]φι	
	[cβητουμεν]ων	

15 [και τους μαρτ]υ >  
(foot?)

Col. ii

(13 lines missing)

[νην τ]ιγξξ επει § 93  
 [θ]ον ημας ποιη  
 [ς]αζθαι επειεθη  
 μεν πρεσβεις επε[μ]  
 5 ψαμ[εν] ηγαγον  
 ο[υ]τ[οι δε]υρο τους  
 ποιη[σο]μενους  
 την [ε]ιρηνην  
 παλιν ενταυθα  
 10 περι τουτ[ου] μεμ  
 φεται τις Α[ι]χ[ι]  
 νην φησι τι[ς εις]η  
 γησασθαι του[των]  
 [[ . ο . νη]] αδι[κειν]  
 15 . . [  
(foot?)

Col. i

1–2 Blob of ink between 1 and 2 (broken by the margin, thus not fully distinguishable as an accent), perhaps interlinear correction, but possibly accidental.

4 At end, filler sign (*diple* form) as in 5, 6, and 15.

8 The final -ων projects into the margin and is thus compressed; this may be due to the fact that the sentence ends here: cf. col. ii 8.

10 In lacuna: τούτου S<sup>1</sup> A: τούτων S<sup>pc</sup> FQY (cf. § 93 = col. ii 10); the space rather suggests τούτων, the original reading of S. τούτου, however, is accepted by Fuhr, on the basis of comparison with περι τούτου in § 93, apparently the reading there of the papyrus as well, to judge from space (ii 10), though F originally read τούτων there, while recording -ον as a correction or variant.

Col. ii

1–2 τ]ιγξξ επει[θ]ον ημας: τινὲς ἡμᾶς ἔπειθον SVAY. The papyrus shows an original variation of word order, but the order of the medieval MSS, accepted by Fuhr, avoids three consecutive short syllables (Blass's Law).

2–3 ποιη[ς]αζθαι SVAY: ποιείσθαι Ortnr.

4 The π of επε[μ] stands exactly below the final η the line above, so the writer does not keep as even a margin here as in col. i.

6 ο[υ]τ[οι]: οἱ SVA: αὐτοί Y.

7–8 ποιη[co]μενους την [ειρ]ηνην: with SVAY against Herwerden's proposal to write *πειομένους* and omit τήν *ειρήνην*.

8 Although the end of [ειρ]ηνην seems more liberally spread than elsewhere, there is space at the end of the line; this could be due to a tendency to finish sentences with line end, cf. col. i 8.

10 F gives *τούτων* with an interlinear *ου* above *-ων*: *τούτου* SQAY; a decision is difficult, but space slightly recommends the latter supplement.

12 φησι: SF<sup>1</sup>Q<sup>99</sup> and corrected in Y: *φήσει* QAY and corrected in F (the two forms are often confused in the manuscript tradition).

14 [ . . ο . νη ] *αδι[κειν]*: *ειρήνην ἢ ἀδικεῖν* SVAY. The bracketed traces carry supralinear expunction dots. It is hard to equate them with any part of transmitted *ειρήνην*, nor any reason to unless that word were miswritten. In any case, it seems the expunction was taken too far, also deleting required ἦ before *ἀδικεῖν*.

15 Traces of ink too abraded to be readable; SVAY have *δτι*.

K. LUCHNER

#### 4574. DEMOSTHENES, XIX 101–2

84/83(f)

5.8 × 14.3 cm

Second century

Fragment of a papyrus roll, written along the fibres on papyrus of poor quality, in a tiny roundish bookhand of informal production with some documentary affinities. The back is blank. The text shows limited correction (supralinear addition in 13, possibly by the same hand). There are diaereses (13, 18). Punctuation by medial point (5, added after writing). In 18 the scribe fails to elide a final vowel. The papyrus affords no opportunity to observe whether or not iota adscript was written. The exact point at which lines ended cannot be determined. Even allowing for the irregularity of the hand, the lines seem to have been of uneven length, another sign of its informal character.

The papyrus probably exhibits a variant word order in 12.

	top?	
	] . . . [	
	] δι . . [	
	λ]ελυμ[αcμενος φανη· αν μεντοι	§ 101
	δι]α ποη[ηριαν c. 5 ] . . . . [	
5	δ]ωρα· και τουτ εξ[ελε]γχ[θηι υπ α]υτων των πεπραγμε[νων μαλ]ιστα μεν ει οιον τ[	
	] . . . ει δε μη ζων[τα -οι]ς παραδει[γμα] ποιη[σατε	
10	σκοπ]ειτε δη τον υπερ τουτ[ων ω]ς δικαιος εcται μεθ υμ[ων αναγκη] δη που τ[ο]υτους τουc [λ]ογο[υc	§ 102



together with decoration of Δ, strengthens the third-century dating of the fragment: compare I 23 (plate VI: Plato, *Laws* with document of AD 295 on the back). Roughly parallel are the hands of XV 1811 and XXVII 2452 (*GMAW*<sup>2</sup> 27).

The text agrees in different places with S and A.

## Fr. 1

col. i

col. ii

[Κορωνει]αν κ[αι] § 148  
 [το Τιλφ]ωσσαιον· και  
 [τους ε]ν Νεωσιω απει  
 [ληφες]αν αυτων και  
 5 [εβδομ]ηκοντα και  
 [διακος]ιους απεκτο  
 [νεσα]ν επι τω Ηδν  
 [λειω] και τροπαιον  
 [ειστη]κει· και Ἴππο  
 10 [κρα]τρων και κακων  
 [Ιλια]ς περιειστηκει  
 [Θηβαιο]υς· ὑμιν δε § 149  
 [τοιουτο]ν μεν ουδεν  
 [ουτ ην] μητε γ[εν]οι  
 foot?

. [ . [

## Fr. 2

[ . . . [ ]  
 [εμοι και] τ[ο]υτοις [πε] § 223  
 [πρακ]ται· και δεδοι § 224  
 [κα δεδ]οικα ειρησε  
 5 [ται γαρ] παντα α φρο  
 [νω προ]ς ὑμας μη το  
 [τε με]ν συνεπισπά  
 [ςησθε] με τον μηδ' οτι



Fr. 3

]. [

ο]ι πρ[εε]                    § 316

[βειε εμιεθ]ωσατο μ[εν]

[τουτον ευ]θξέωε οπ[ωε]

5 [ευνερει κ]αι ευναγ[ω]

[νιειται τω ] μιαρω[ ]

[Φιλοκρατε]ι και των

]. [

Fr. 1, col. i

2 *Τιλφ*ωεεαιον. The papyrus attests two sigmas with Υ, the second over a tear, but unproblematic. *Τιλφω-αιον* SVA. The spelling with two sigmas is also attested at §141 (Υ, SFmg) and in Harpocration (s.v.), though there was a fair amount of confusion on this point in antiquity. Strabo has *-ωεεον* (g. 410) and *-ωειον* (g. 413) of the town; *-ωεειον* (g. 411) of the mountain, *-ωεεα* (ibid.) of the spring, and *-ωεειωε* (ibid.) of the god; meanwhile *Τιλφούειον* is the form given by Pausanias (g. 33. 1, of the mountain); Plutarch, *Sulla* 20 has *Τιλφώεειον*, Apollodorus (3. 7. 3) has *τραφουείαν* (A, emended by Heyne to *Τιλφούεεαν*). The papyrus' reading may thus stand as a genuine and correct variant, rather than a slip in dittography.

3 *Νεώειν*: to distinguish it from *νέωειν*. The MSS apparently transmit *Νέωειν* here too; but *-ώειν* would follow the general rule that disyllabic town-names in *-ων* are oxytone (Steph. Byz. s.v. *Αίεών*).

α has an extra flourish, or slip of the pen, after making the loop.

13 *τοιουτο*ν with F<sup>1</sup>Q: *τοιούτο* SFAY, adopted by Fuhr.

Fr. 2

5 *παντα* with FQ: *πάνθ'* SY: *ἄπανθ'* A (MacDowell).

7–8 *με*ν: SVAYP: *με* S<sup>sup</sup>, which then omits *με* after *ευνεεεπείεεθε*. SVAYP all have *με* after *ευνεεεπείεεθε*. VYP, however, have *τούτοιε* added after *μὲν*, and S<sup>sup</sup> adds it after the *με* that it substitutes for *μὲν*. The papyrus clearly did not add *τούτοιε* after *μὲν* with VYP, and so agreed with A and the original reading of S, i.e. *μὲν ευνεεεπείεεθε με*, printed by Fuhr.

Fr. 3

There is no preserved line-end, and therefore division of lines is not certain, but the divisions set out above seem to produce the most even ends. The tiny, alternative form of ω in line 6 to shorten the line (as fr. 1 i 10), shows that the preserved letters above are very near the right-hand margin, perhaps within a letter or two.

4 [τουτον ευ]θξέωε. So SVY: *εὐθέωε τουτον* A.

6 τω ] μιαρω[ ]. Iota adscript not written in fr. 1 i 7. Space considerations are neutral. If the iotas were written, the scribe's practice was inconsistent.

R. ASHDOWNE  
I. RUFFELL  
T. TSIROPOULOU

## 4576. DEMOSTHENES, XIX 150-1

106/29(a)

3.2 × 5.8 cm

Third/fourth century

Scrap from a papyrus roll written along the fibres in a medium-large Biblical Majuscule of early type. No margin survives to the left, but the paragraphus at 7-8 indicates that we do have line-beginnings. On the right, the supplements printed vary somewhat in length: in particular, that in 4 is four letters shorter than that in 3. Unless there was a variant, we must assume that (as often in this style of script) the line-ends were irregular or tailored by reducing the letter size.

The script exhibits tidy, regular letter spacing and little decoration apart from serifs on ends of top-stroke of τ (5) and considerable shading in letter strokes. Strongly bilinear apart from ρ, γ, and probably φ (4) where the tail is broken. There is also some wavering in the line of writing, e.g. unevenness in 6 where γ descends below the line, and × appears to float to the top line. ϰ written in three strokes, with diagonal cross-stroke leaving the left leg at the bottom line. Extraordinarily narrow column (10 letters in 4). The scribe fails to elide a final vowel (*scriptio plena*) in 3, the only observable case. There is no opportunity to observe whether iota adscript was written or not. Punctuation by paragraphus below 7. The back is blank.

	·            ·            ·            ·	
	λησπον[του και]	§ 150
	μη προε[σθαι μη]	
	δε εασαι κ[ατασχειν]	
	Φιλιππον [μη]	
5	δεν εν τω [μετα]	
	[ξ]υ χρονω [των]	
	εκει χωρι[ων η]	§ 151
	δεν γαρ α[κριβως]	
	οτι π[ανθ οσαν εκ]	
	·            ·            ·            ·	

1 Wavy trace above ο, seemingly not an accent.

2-3 μηδὲ AFQ; μηδ' SY.

3 εασαι κ[ατασχειν] SVY; κατασχεῖν postponed until after μηδὲν (lines 4-5) in A.

7 εκει SA: ἐκεῖ τι VY.

**4577. DEMOSTHENES, XIX** 154–8, 173–5, 203–5, 211, 231–2, 234–40, 243–5, 293–4

28 4B.61/G(4–5)a  
 29 4B.56/X(12–13)a  
 112/22  
 114/50(b)  
 118/14(d)

Fr. 1 16 × 13 cm

Later third century

Fragments of several columns from a papyrus roll. The back is blank. Its columns contained up to 35 lines of text, c. 23 cm. in height. The roll had deep top and bottom margins (at least 4 and 4.5 cm respectively), combining to give a roll at least 31.5 cm in height. The intercolumnium is about 2 cm, and the average width of columns 4.5 cm, with a line of 11–15 letters. On the width of columns in oratorical papyri see W. A. Johnson, *Proceedings of the 20th International Congress of Papyrologists* (Copenhagen 1994) 423–7; id., *The Literary Papyrus Roll* (Diss., Yale 1992) 167–77. In this format the entire speech would have occupied about 200 columns in a papyrus roll of about 4 m.

The script is a right-sloping ‘Severe Style’. Narrow ε, ø, ο, c; α is triangular; ζ is in 3 strokes (of book-hand type); ω with a flat bottom, at a diagonal to the line; sometimes the cross-stroke of η has a tendency to become horizontal. Cross-shaped ψ. The initial letters are slightly enlarged. The writing is to be assigned to the later third century by comparison with I 23 with plate VI (Plato, *Laws IX*), dated earlier than AD 295 on the basis of a consular date in a document on the verso. Also worth comparing is P. Ups. inv. 114 + P. Bon. 7 + PSI XVII Congr. 10, three fragments coming from the same codex and preserving Isocr. *Ad Nic.* 32–6; cf. *Trenta testi greci da papiri letterari*, ed. M. Manfredi (Florence 1983) 23–9, pl. IV. P. Herm. Rees 4 (plate III; Cavallo and Maehler, *GBEPP* 2a) and 5 (plate IV; Turner, *GMAW*<sup>2</sup> 70), documents from the Theophanes archive datable to the early fourth century, show the development of the script.

η at line-end is sometimes written as a short raised horizontal stroke. There are occasional filler-strokes at the ends of lines, apparently added later. Sentence break is marked by paragraphus together with high stop. Medial points also appear: some of these were applied at the time of writing, some were squeezed in afterwards, in the same black ink. The scribe sometimes leaves spaces between words; iota adscript once omitted (fr. 1–3 ii 4), twice written (fr. 1–3 ii 18, fr. 11–14 iv 29), where we can observe. There are occasional iotacistic spellings (fr. 4 i 15, fr. 11–14 iv 11). Elision is applied inconsistently (i.e. sometimes there is *scriptio plena*), but never marked. Inorganic diaeresis occurs over initial γ. A dicolon is used at a point where a ψήφισμα would have been inserted (154). A sign, similar to a x, appears twice in the upper margins. Its meaning is still undetermined (something similar in another papyrus of Demosthenes XIX, *GMAW*<sup>2</sup> 67). It may have been put in the margin by a second hand just to check or to mark something, for instance the number of columns already corrected by a διορθωτής or covered by a reader.

There are several corrections (in § 237 by a different hand) and numerous agreements and disagreements with the transmitted text of varying interest.

Frr. 1-3: §§ 154-8

Col. i

	[θανηται γρα]ψας	§ 154
	[ωσπε]ρ νυν λ[εγ]ω >	
	[τοις] ρημασι ουτως	
	[αντ]ικρυς και μοι	
5	[λεγ]ε το ψηφισμα	
	[τουτο λαβω]ν:	
	[ ψηφισμα ]	
	[ενθενδε με]ν τοι	§ 155
	[νυν αυτους εξη]γα	
10	[γον ουτως ακου]τας	
	[ως καθαρως οι]ς με	
	[τα ταυτ εποιου]ν ει	
	[εεσθε επειδη γ]αρ	
	[αφικομεθ εις Ω]ρε	
15	[ον και συνεμει]ξα	
	[μεν τω Προξεν]ωι	
	[αμελησαντες ο]ν	

Col. ii

X

	τοι του πλειν [και]	§ 155
	τα προστεταχ[μενα]	
	πραττειν επορευ	
	οντο κυκλω και	
5	π[ρι]ν εις Μακεδονι	
	[αν ελθ]ειν τρεις και	
	[εικοσιν ημερ]ας αν	
	[ηλωσαμεν τα]ς δε	
	(c. 8 lines missing)	
	ορος π[αν]τα πρα >	§ 156
	γματ εν ειρηνηι	

και σπονδαις ηρει >  
 20 και διωκειτο Φιλιπ  
 προς πολλα λεγον'τος ε  
 μου [κ]αι θρυλουν  
 τος αει· το μεν πρω  
 τον ως αν εις κοινο(ν)  
 25 γνωμην αποφαι  
 νομενου· μετα >  
 ταυτα δ ως αγνο >  
 ουντας διδακκου  
 τος· τελευτωντος  
 30 δε ως αν προς πε  
 πρακοτας αυτους  
 και ανοσιωτατους  
 ανθρωπους ουδεν >  
 υποστειλλομενου·  
 35 ο δε τουτοις αντι § 157

Col. iii

(2 lines missing)

ουμενος [οις ελεγον] § 157  
 μεν εγω ε[ψηφιστο δε]  
 5 [υφ υ]μων ο[υτος ην]  
 [ει δε κ]αι πα[σιν ηρε]  
 [σκευ ταυτα τ]οις αλλ[οις]  
 [πρεσβεσιν α]υτικ εις[ε]  
 [σθε εγω] μεν γαρ  
 10 [ουδεν πω λ]εγω πε  
 [ρι ουδενο]ς ου  
 (5 lines missing)  
 αλλα [δι αυτον και]  
 δια το μ[η κεκοινω]  
 νηκεναι των [αδι]  
 20 κηματων· οτι μ[εν]

γαρ αἰσχροῖ[[ς]] καὶ δε[ι]  
 να καὶ ο[υ π]ροικα >  
 τα πεπρεσβευμε  
 να παντες ὑ[μεις]  
 25 εωρακατε [οιτινες]  
δ οι τουτων [μετε]  
ζηχο[τες αυτο]  
 δη[λωσει αλλ εν τωι] § 158  
 χ[ρονωι τους ορκους]  
 30 ελα[βον παρα των]  
 κυμμ[αχων η τα]  
 αλλα α [προσηκεν]  
 [ ]

## Fr. 1–3

Cols. i–ii: these lines overlap with **4570** fr. 3.

## Col. i

3 *ρημασι*: nu ἐφελκυστικόν was not written, though the scribe normally does so elsewhere before words beginning with a vowel and at end of clause. *-μασιν* SVAY. Here it is apparently an accidental omission.

5–6 το ψηφισμα [τουτο. τοῦτο τὸ ψηφισμα SVAY.

7 Presumably the rubric *ψηφισμα* stood here, as in other oratorical papyri except when the texts of (usually spurious) documents themselves are inserted: e.g. IV **701** (see Hausmann 38–40); P. Ryl. I 57; P. Ryl. I 58 (see Hausmann 95–109); P. Ant. I 27; and three Aeschines papyri: LX **4037**, **4041**, **4048**. Fuhr notes that the rubric is omitted here in S, where a blank space stands instead.

## Col. ii

2 προσεταχ[μενα SVAY Fuhr: προσεταγμενα F<sup>1</sup>.

7 εικοσι SVAY, **4570**, Fuhr, and the papyrus had enough space for it: εἴκοσι A<sup>1</sup>.

17 π[αν]τα πρα judging from space: πάντα τὰ πρα- SVAY, **4570**.

20–1 διωκειτο Φιλιππος with A: διωκεῖθ' ὁ Φίλιππος SVY.

21–2 εμου SFY: μου F<sup>1</sup> QA.

29 At beginning, τος corrected from τας.

30 αν SVY: om. A.

προς SV: om. Y: προπε- without προς A.

31 αυτους SA: αὐτούς Y (MacDowell): éavτούς V.

34 υποστειλλομενου SAY: ὑποστελλόμενος V.

35 ο SVAYP: οδ A<sup>1</sup>.

## Col. iii

18 The papyrus repeated διὰ before τό, which is nowhere recorded in the tradition.

23–4 The papyrus' reading τα πεπρεσβευμενα is unique, where SVAYP have τὰ πεπραγμένα; cf. §131 τὰ . . . πεπραγμένα. καὶ πεπρεσβευμένα. τὰ πεπρεσβευμένα could be defended as more precise than τὰ πεπραγμένα in the context, recalling as it does the expression occurring several lines above εἰ δὲ καὶ πάντων ἤρεσκε ταῦτα τοῖς ἄλλοις

πρέσβευ, as well as the central topic of the speech. On the other hand, it could have been deduced from an original τὰ πεπραγμένα due to the fact that προίκα occurs in conjunction with πρεσβεύω three times in this speech: 119 τῷ προίκα πρεσβεύοντι, 232 προίκα πρεσβεύειν, 282 προίκα πεπρεσβευκέναι.

25 *εωρακατε. έορ-* MSS here, but in other passages *έωρ-* too is transmitted (Fuhr i p. xxx). Cf. fr. 7. 2. *έορ-* is metrically guaranteed in Old Comedy (e.g. Eup. fr. 193. 3 with KA's note) and later in Machon 40, 42 Gow; *έωρ-* appears already in an inscription of the early second century BC (Threatte II 488). Cf. fr. 7. 2 below.

27 *αυτο* with S and adopted by Fuhr; or *αὐτὰ* VAYP.

28 Since in the middle of this line a strong pause occurs, we expect a paragraphus at the beginning to mark sentence-end together with a high stop after *δηλώσει*. The paragraphus appears to have been misplaced at the beginning of the previous line, in which a much less strong pause occurs.

28–9 SVAYP have *ἀλλὰ νῆ Δί' ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ*, which is too long for the space available here, i.e. the papyrus omitted the oath and the demonstrative pronoun.

Fr. 4

Col. i

Χ

	[κα]ιτοι και τα αλλ [αν]	§ 173
	[απ]αντα ακολουθω[ς]	
	[τουτ]οις επε[π]ρακ[το]	
	[ει τις] επει[θετο μοι]	
5	[ου] γαρ εγω[γ ουτως α]	
	[θλι]ος ουδ α[φρων]	
	[ην] ωστε χ[ρ]ηματα	
	[μ]εν διδοναι λαμ	
	[βα]νοντας ορων ετε	
10	[ρο]υς υπερ της προς	
	[υ]μας φιλοτιμίας· α δ α	
	νευ μεν δαπανης	
	ην οια τε πραχθηναι	
	[πολλωι δε] μειζονας	
15	[ειχεν ωφε]λ[ε]ιας πα	
	[ςη τη πολ]ει ταυτ ου	
	. . . . .	

Col. ii

. . . . .	
. [	
το μ[η]?	§ 174?
. . . . .	

Fr. 4  
Col. i

- 1 *αν* in this position with SVYP: *αν* after *ἀκολουθως* A.  
2 *απ|αντα*: so SVAYP: *πάντ- E*.  
5-7 [*ην*] post *ἄφρων* VP: ante *ἄθλιος* add. A: om. SY.  
8 [*μ|εν*] SVAY: om. P<sup>1</sup> add. P rec.  
13 *ην οια τε* P<sup>1</sup>: *οἶά τ' ἦν* SVAYP.  
15 [*ειχεν ωφε|λ|ε|ιας*] SVYP: *ὠφελείας εἶχε* A.

Col. ii

- 2 Perhaps from *απεψηφισαν|το μ|η πεμπευ*, §174.

Fr. 5

	·            ·            ·            ·	
	[ <i>χρον</i> ]ο <sup>ν</sup> [ <i>εντυγχα</i> ]	§ 175
	[ <i>νω</i> ]ν ουδ οτι[ο <sup>υν</sup> ]	
	[ <i>επα</i> ]υσατο Φι[ <i>λιπ</i> ]	
	[ <i>πωι</i> ]· και τα μ[ <i>εν</i> ]	
5	[ <i>αλ</i> ]λα ζιωπω [ <i>Δερ</i> ]	
	[ <i>κ</i> ]ν[ <i>λο</i> ]ς δ αυτον [ε <sup>ν</sup> ]	
	[ <i>Φερ</i> ]αις τ[ <i>ην νυ</i> ]	
	[ <i>κτ ε</i> ]φ[ <i>υλαττεν</i> ]	
	·            ·            ·            ·	

5-6 [*Δερ*][*κ*]ν[*λο*]ς with SVAYP, except *δέρκυλλος* A<sup>1</sup>, where the accent was subsequently deleted.

7-8 *νυ*][*κτ ε*]φ[-. Even if this line-division makes 7 shorter than expected, the remains of the upper end of a long vertical going well above the line in 8—to judge from the interlinear space elsewhere in our fragment—point to φ quite unmistakably. For a similar word-division, see fr. 1-3 col. ii 20-1 above, *πρα>|γματ*.

Fr. 6

	·            ·            ·            ·	
	[ <i>δι</i> ]καια[ <i>ν ητις εστιν</i> ]	§ 203
	[ <i>α</i> ]πολογια φ . [C. 2]	
	[ . . ]α· η μεν τφ[ <i>ινυν</i> ]	
	[ <i>δι</i> ]καια και απ[ <i>λη</i> ]	
5	[ <i>η ω</i> ]ς ου πεπρακ[ <i>ται</i> ]	
	[ <i>τα</i> ] κατηγορημ[ <i>ενα</i> ]	
	[ <i>δει</i> ]ξαι η ως `τά`πε[ <i>πρα</i> ]	
	[ <i>γμ</i> ]ενα κυμφ[ <i>ερει</i> ]	



[τ]ηι πολει· του[των]  
 10 [δ ο]υδετερον δ[υναι]

2 [α]πολογία SVAYP, the case accepted by Fuhr: ἀπολογία Dobree.

2–3 φ· [c. 2][. .]α: φευ[ξετ]αι VYP, om. SA, rejected by Fuhr.

7 τα suprascript in a different, more cursive hand and ink: λ has a left loop instead of the scribe's characteristic spiky leg. τὰ before πεπραγμένα seems unwanted, nor is it recorded anywhere in the tradition.

## Fr. 7

[πειε]αι γε του[αυ] § 204  
 [τουε] εωρακ[οταε]  
 [υμ]αε και ευ ειδ[ο]  
 [ταε]· ουκουν ωε [ου] § 205  
 5 [κεκοι]νωνηκα [του]  
 [τοι]ε ουδεν[οε λου]  
 [πο]ν μοι δε[ιξει]  
 [βε]ουλεεθ ο[υν]  
 [υμιν π]αντα [ταλλα]

1 γε: om. SVAYP. του[αυ]: SVAYP: om. Q.

2 εωρακ[οταε] with SAF<sup>N</sup>Y<sup>D</sup>CP: έορακόταε FQY<sup>ac</sup> (MacDowell).

7 μοι SVAY: έμοι F<sup>1</sup>QP.

## Fr. 8

πρεεβε[ευεα διε ου] § 211  
 τωι κ[αι λογον υμιν]  
 δουναι πρ[οελεθων]  
 Αιεχινη[ε ουτοε]  
 5 [το]ιε λογ[ιεταε]

1–2 I. ουτω.

3 δουναι: δοόναι διε SVAYP.

## Fr. 9

[χε]ρημα[τα ειεληφο] § 231

[τα]ς και δ[ωρα και]  
 [κατ]αισχυν[αντας]  
 [εαυ]τους τ[ην πο]  
 5 [λιν] τους εα[υτων]  
 [παιδας] αφει[σαν]  
 . . . . .

6 αφει[σαν] SQAP: ἀφίεσαν FYP<sup>1</sup> ut vid. But the papyrus may have read αφει[εσαν] (cf. fr. 11–14 col. iv 11, v 1).

## Fr. 10

. . . . .  
 [κρι]νετε [του] § 232  
 [το]υς τημερον  
 [α]λλα και νομ[ο](ν)  
 [τι]θεσθε εις παν  
 5 [τα] τον μετα ταυτα  
 [χ]ρ[ο]νον ποτερον  
 χρηματων αισχυρ[.]'ωζ

<sup>2</sup> After *τήμερον* (*τημερον* pap.), there may have been space at end of the line for two letters (*οὐ* SAV), but extended **η** suggests line-end and that the papyrus omitted *οὐ* as do YP.

<sup>4-5</sup> παν|[τα: ἅπαντα SVAYP, Fuhr.

## FR. 11–14

## Col. i

. . . . .  
 . . . [ § 234  
 τας ε[κκλησιας]  
 εν αις [εμελλετε]  
 βουλε[υεσθαι περι]  
 5 της ε[ιρηνης ουδε]  
 υ[ος ουτε λογου]  
 πω π[αρα τουτων]  
 ουτε [αδικηματος]  
 οντο[ς φανερον το]  
 10 νομι[μον εθος ποι]  
 ων κα[ι επηνεα]

τουτο[υς και εις]  
 το πρυ[τανειον]  
 εκαλε[σα και νη] § 235  
 15 Δι εγω[γε και τους]  
 παρα τ[ου Φιλιπ]  
 που πρ[εσβεις εξε]  
 νισα [και πανυ]  
 γε ω αν[δρες Αθη]  
 20 ναιοι λ[αμπρωσ]  
 επειδη γα[ρ εωρων]  
 αυτους [και επι]  
 τοις τ[οιουτοις]

Col. ii

[ηδικη]σθαι και φ[α] § 236  
 [γερο]υς τουτους >  
 [πεπρ]ακοτας αυ  
 [τους γ]ενεσθαι· [ο]  
 5 [τ αρτι] μεν ηκον  
 [οι πρ]εσβεις το πρω  
 [τον] εδει δ ακουσαι  
 [τον] δημον τι  
 [λεγου]σιν· οϋδεπω  
 10 [δε ου]δ ουτος συν  
 [. . .]ν δηλος ην  
 [τωι Φιλ]οκρατει· ου  
 [τε τοιαυ]τα εκει >  
 [νος γρα]φων· αν >

Col. iii

[ ] § 236 (cont.)  
 [ ].  
 [ ]  
 [των ειςιν προτε]ροι· με  
 5 [τα ταυτα δε ο]ϋδεν

[εμοι προς το]υτους  
[οικειον ουδε κοι]υ[ον] γε

(c. 17 lines missing)

25 [ ] . . . [ § 237  
υ[πο]στελλο[μενον]  
ημεις δ Αφοβητε  
και συ Φιλοχάρες σε μεν  
τας [αλ]αβαστροθη  
30 κας γραφοντα και  
τα τυμπανα του  
[τους] δε ὑπογραμ  
[μα]τεας και τους  
τυχοντας αν >  
35 [θ]ρωπους και ουδε

Col. iv

[μια]ς κακιας ταυ § 237 (cont.)  
[τ αλ]λ ουδε στρατη  
γιας αξια πρεσβει  
ων στρατηγιων >

5 των μεγαϊστων τι  
[μων] ηξιωσαμ[εν]  
ει [τοι]νυν μηδ[εν] § 238  
[υμ]ων ηδι[κει] μη  
[δεις ο]υχ ημεις χα  
10 [ριν υμιν ου]θενος >  
[αλλα υμεις] ημειν δι  
[καιως ει]χετε του  
[των πολλο]υς γαρ ὑ

(9 lines missing)

ζ[οισθε εγω μεν οι]  
μ[αι πολλωι βιασον]  
25 τα[ι τοινυν ιως]

μ[εγαλοφωνοι και]  
 αν[α]ιδεις [ο]ν[τες και]  
 το [συ]γγν[ω]μη[ν α]  
 δ[ε]λ[φ]ωι β[ο]ηθ[εω]  
 30 προσειλ[ηφ]οτ[ε]ς υ § 239  
 μεις δε μ[η η]τ[τ]α >  
 εθε εκε[νω] εϋθυ  
 μουμενοι οτι του  
 τοις μεν [το]υτου >  
 35 προσηκει φρο<ν>τιζει(ν).

Col. v

[υ]μειν δε [των νο] § 239 (cont.)  
 μων και [ολης της πολε]  
 ως και παρ[α παντα]  
 των ορκ[ων ους αυ]  
 5 τοι καθη[ε]θε ομω  
μοκοτες κ[αι γαρ ει]  
 τινων δε [δεην]  
 ται τουτο[νι σω]  
 ζειν ποτ[ε]ρ αν μη]  
 10 δεν αδικ[ων φαι]  
 νηται τ[ην πολιν]  
 (c. 12 lines missing)  
 [θεις τ]ογ νομ[ον ει]  
 25 [δεν] το κρυβδ[ην ψη]  
[φιζ]ε[[ι]]εθαι· δια [τι]  
 [οτι του]των μ[εν ου]  
 [δεις εισεται] τ[ον ε]  
 α[ντωι κεχαριςμε]  
 30 ν[ον υμων οι θεοι]  
 δ [εικονται και το]  
 δ[αιμονιον τον]  
 μ[η τα δικαια ψη]

φ[ισαμενον παρ ων] § 240  
 35 κ[ρειττον εστιν]

Fr. 11–14

Col. i

2 *τας: ταῖς* SVYP: ἐν ταῖς A: <πρὶν γενέσθαι> τὰς ἐκκλησίας Weil. The traces in 1 would allow ἐν τ[ωι δημωι] as transmitted (or ἐν τ[ωι δημωι] εν, if the last letters were squeezed), in which case *τας* may be simply an error. But since the grammar is difficult, as Weil's conjecture suggests, *τας* could be a real variant.

9–10 *το* | νομι[μον εθος] SV: τὸ κοινὸν ἔθος S<sup>39</sup>V<sup>9</sup>P<sup>9</sup>A: τὸ κοινὸν νόμιμον P<sup>1</sup>: τὸ κοινὸν νόμιμον ἔθος YP<sup>4</sup>: τὸ νόμιμον Weil.

13 *το πρυ[τανειον]* F corr. QAYP: τὸ om. SV.

15 *και* SVYP: om. A.

18 The writer left a gap between *νη* and *κα*, avoiding the edge of a sheet join.

22 *και* SVYP: om. A.

Col. ii

1 *τι* om. pap.

7 *εδει δ ακουσαι*: printed by Fuhr. SAY actually have *εδει δε ακουσαι* (MacDowell). VP give a different order, *ακουσαι δε εδει*.

9 The papyrus did not share the reading *οδδεποτε* possibly given only by A before correction.

10 *ου]*δ: *ουθ'* SVAYP (MacDowell).

10–11 Certainty is impossible, but space at the beginning of 11 may favour *συνερῶν* with SVYP against A's *συναίρων*.

12 After *τει*, high point added after writing in different ink.

13 Stroke at end perhaps an aborted *η* rather than a filler-stroke.

13–14 *τοιαν]τα εκει*[[*νος* AP: *εκεινος τοιαυτα* SVY, adopted by Fuhr.

14 *γρα]φων*: the right side of the oval of *φ* is clear. *γραφων* too is read by A P<sup>1</sup>, whereas SVY have *γραψων*, printed by Fuhr.

Col. iii

1–3 The missing text will have fitted neatly into three lines almost entirely lost from the beginning of the column. It is, impossible to tell whether A's *μεμνήσθαι* stood here, or *μέμνησθε* of the rest of the tradition (hence it is left unrestored).

26 ]*τελλο*[: *λλ* rewritten over *ιλ*. Omicron not altered. The papyrus as corrected read *υπο]τελλο[μενον* with SF<sup>9</sup>QY, adopted by Fuhr, where AP give *υποτειλάμενον*.

27 *δε* following *ήμεις* not transmitted elsewhere.

28 Supralinear addition in rougher script. SA too read the vocative (nominative at first written in S). Other MSS show signs of trouble at this point: *εμεν σε μεν* in VY, an erasure of 5–6 letters before *σε* in P. In the papyrus before correction the name is only partially present. Thus the papyrus before correction may show an intermediate stage of corruption, carefully corrected, perhaps by collation with a different copy. There is a dot of ink between *γ* and *ρ*, at the point of textual omission.

29–30 SVAYP also give *αλαβαστροθήκας. αλαβαστροθήκας* is given by Harpocration.

Col. iv

2–3 *ουδε στρατηγίας αξια: ουδε στρατηγίας γ' αξια* VYP: *ουδε γε στρατηγίας αξια* A. S has *ου στρατηγίας γ' αξια* (*γ'* in rasure), and this is printed by Fuhr, retaining *γ'*. Cf. 4578 fr. 1 i 5–6 and n.

7–8 *μηδ[εν | υμ]ων* SVAY: *υμων μηδεν* P.

12 *ει]χετε* A P<sup>1</sup>, where SVY have *εχοιτε*, including P<sup>39</sup>, adopted by Fuhr.

27 It is not clear that there is room for *και* at line end. Was it omitted?

28 Spacing suggests that the papyrus read *συγγνώμην* with SVAYP.

30–1 *υμεις* with SVAYP: *ήμεις* Q.

31–2 *η][τ[τ]α|εθε* S<sup>pc</sup>, the correct reading: *ήτταεθαι* S<sup>1ac</sup>.

32–3 *ενθυ|μουμενοι* SVYP: *ένθυμηθέντες* A.

33–4 *του|τοις* S<sup>pc</sup>VAP: *τούτους* S<sup>1ac</sup>Y.

Col. v

2 Not room for *δλης* before *τήε πόλεωε*?

24–5 *ει][δεν]*: Spacing suggests that *εδδεν* was present in our text, in agreement with the MSS except Y<sup>1</sup>, which omitted it, although the form was then added (Y<sup>2</sup>).

25 *το* SVYP: *του* A.

25–6 *το κρύβδην ψηφίζεσθαι* del. Herwerden.

26 *δια [τι]* with VAYP and the corrector of S, against the original reading in the latter MS, which omitted it, followed by Fuhr.

Fr. 15

. . . . .

[ηντινα λαοι π]ολ § 243  
 [λοι φημιξωε]ι θεοε  
 [νυ τιε εετι κα]ι αυ  
 [τη ουκο]νν Αιεχι  
 5 [νη και ε]ε παντεε  
 [ουτοι χρη]ματ ε[κ]  
 [τηε πρ]εεβειεαε  
 . . . . .

<sup>1</sup> This line overlaps with **4579** front, 15.

<sup>1–3</sup> These lines are longer by 1–3 letters than 4–7, suggesting that they stood in *ekthesis*. Hesiod *Op.* 761–2 is quoted. With line 4, in which the quotation ends, the scribe appears to have reverted to the normal level of the left margin.

<sup>2</sup> *φημιξωε]ι* SVY: *φημίξουε* A: *φημίξαιε* P corr.

Frr. 16–17

Col. i

. . . . .

ετι[ν Ελληνων] § 244  
 ουδε βαρβ[αρων]  
 οετιε ου φηειν  
 χρηματ εκ τηε  
 5 πρεεβειεαε ειλη  
 φεναι· ωετε ειπ[ερ]  
 \_\_\_\_\_

εστιν αληθης [η]  
 φημη καθ υμ[ων]  
 εστιν η παρ[α των]  
 10 πολλων η[ν οτι]  
 πιστην ειν[αι δει]  
 και θεος νυ [τις]  
 [ε]στι και αυτη [και]  
 [ο]τι σοφ[ο]ς η[ν ο ποι]  
 15 [η]της [ο τ]αυ[τα ποι]  
 [η]cas cu διωριζας >  
 [αυ]τος· ετι τ[οι]νυν  
 [ια]μβια δηπου κυ(ν)  
 [λε]ξας επεραινεν·  
 20 [οιο]ν οστις δ ομειλων  
 [ηδε]ται κακοις  
 [αηρ ου πωπ]οτ' η  
 [ρωτησα γιγν]ωσκω(ν)  
 [ο]τι τοιουτος εστιν  
 25 [οι]ςπερ ηδεταται >  
 [ξ]υνων· ειτα τον  
 εις τας ορνεις ει  
 σιοντα και με  
 [τ]α Πιτταλακου  
 30 [π]εριοντα και

§ 245

Col. ii

τοιαν[τ ειπων]  
 αγνοει[τ εφη ποι]  
 ον τινα [ηγεισθαι]  
δει· ου[κουν Αισχνη]

Fr. 16–17

Col. i

1 The rest of the tradition places the verb following βαρβάρων (line 2 here).

7 εστιν A: ἐστ' SY: om. VP.

8 καθ SY: καὶ καθ' VAP.



17 [αυ]τος SVAYP: αὐτὸν A<sup>1</sup>.

18 [ια]μβια. ἰαμβεία SVYP: εἰ in ras. F: ἰάμβια Q: ἰαμβία A item v. 16 et p. 495, 5. II.

δηπου SVYP: om. A Gregor. Cor. VII 1322, 15 W.

At end, superscript stroke over cΥ, representing cv(v); read cvλ-.

22–6 ου . . . [ξ]υνων: the same extent of the iambic quotation is also preserved in III **410** 103–7 = Eur.

*Phoenix* fr. 812, 7–9 N<sup>2</sup>.

25 [οι]επερ SVAYP: so also presumably **410** 106 εστω [. . . . .] ηδ-: οἰπερ S<sup>1</sup>: ἐθ' οἴοιπερ H. Wolf.

26 τον SVAYP: τὼν A<sup>1</sup>.

27 τας AYP<sup>1</sup> Gregor.: τοὺς SVP<sup>4</sup>.

ορνεις SVAYP: ὄρνις F corr. Gregor.

Col. ii

4 This line overlaps with **4579** back, 1.

A solitary trace of the first letter of the bottom line of the column also survives.

Fr. 18

[υστερον ημε]ρα[ις] § 293  
 [επι την τραπέζαν]  
 [εθηκεν επτ]α μ[νας]

(8 lines missing)

και ζωζειν κε[λευ]  
 εις· και μη[ν] οτι [ταυ] § 294  
 τα μ[ε]ν φοβερα [και]  
 15 πρ[ο]νοιας κα[ι]  
 φυλακη[ς] πολλ[ης]  
 δεομενα εφ [οις]  
 δε cv εκεινου[ς]  
 εκρεινεις γελω[ς]  
 20 εκειθεν οψε[ςθε]  
 ησαν εν Ηλιδ[ι]  
 τα κοινα κλε[πτον]  
 τες [τινες και]  
 μαλα [εικος γε εστιν]  
 25 ου[ν] οστις μετεσχευ[εν]  
 αυ[τοθι νυν του]  
 τ[ων του καταλυ]

## Fr. 18

Lines 1–24 overlap with P. Teb. II 267 col. i 8–24.

4–11 Fibres stripped.

14 μ[ε]ν: μέν ἐστιν SVAYP, P. Teb. II 267.

14–15 [καί] πρ[ο]νοίας with SVYP, P. Teb. II 267: omitted in A.

15 Extra space at the end of the line (otherwise too short) was probably occupied by a filler sign.

18 δε εὐ κεῖνου[ς]: δ' ἐκείνου εὐ SVYP, P. Teb. II 267: εὐ omitted in A.

19 κερειν[ε]ς SVAYP (ἐκρινε[ς]): κερεινας P. Teb. 267.

20 κειθεν VAP: ἐκείνωσ SYF<sup>vp</sup> and P. Teb. 267.

οψε[σθ]ει SVAYP: εἴσεσθε S<sup>vp</sup>.

22 [πτον] must have been written tightly to fit the space.

22–3 κλέπτοντες τὰ κοινὰ τινας SVAYP.

D. COLOMO  
A. GIACOMONI  
C. JUNG  
A. NODAR  
P. PORMANN

**4578.** DEMOSTHENES, XIX 237, 240, 306–7

21 3B.28/H(1–3)b  
+ K(1–3)a

8 × 7 cm (fr. 1)

Second/third century

Two fragments, apparently from the same papyrus roll, written along the fibres. Fr. 1 shows remains of two columns plus intercolumnium and lower margin of at least 3 cm, fr. 2 of one column with left margin and most of the intercolumnium; there is a possible trace of another column on the left (a speck of ink opposite 10–11). The back is blank.

The hand is a formal, angular ‘Severe Style’ with a slight slant to the right. **IX 1174** (Turner–Parsons, *GMAW*<sup>2</sup> 34) has the same ‘squarish’ appearance of the hand. P. Berol. inv. 9766 (Seider, *Paläogr. der griech. Pap.* ii. 33) is also comparable, although the present hand is more upright. Like **XXVIII 2486** (Seider, ii. 34), it appears more formal and less developed than the Severe Style of the third century. Among the other published Demosthenes papyri, the hand of our papyrus somewhat resembles P. Med. 16 (*In Timocratem*), but is more strictly bilinear, and more upright than **LVI 3846** (*In Meidiam*). It is written more slowly and carefully than **LVI 3849** (*In Meidiam*) but with much the same ‘squarish’ letter shapes. None of these hands are objectively dated; their assigned dates recommend a date for our papyrus of the late second or early third century.

The reconstructed lines average 22–3 letters. On this basis the 1065 letters missing between col. i and col. ii of fr. 1 occupied 46–8 lines; therefore col. ii had at least 50 lines (52 at most). For comparisons for the high number of lines see Schubart, *Das Buch bei den Griechen und Römern*, 1961<sup>3</sup>, 56–7, paralleled by other Demosthenes papyri: P. Fay. 8 (49–50 lines); **III 462** (45–6 lines); **VI 858** (46 lines); A. E. Samuel, *BASP* 2 (1964–5) 33–40 (45 lines). The height of a column can be estimated at 26.5–28 cm.; the total height of the roll must have been at least 33 cm. With no line complete, the width of a column can be estimated

at 5.5–6 cm. On the width of columns in oratorical papyri see W. A. Johnson, *Proceedings of the 20th International Congress of Papyrologists*, Copenhagen 1994, 423–7; Turner–Parsons, *GMAW*<sup>2</sup>, 7. The intercolumnium on fr. 1 is approximately 1.4 cm wide. Assuming this was a single papyrus roll containing all of Demosthenes' *De falsa legatione*, 22 columns must be missing between fr. 1 and fr. 2; the whole speech would have occupied 105 columns, giving the papyrus roll a total length of approximately 7.5 m.

The papyrus shows several reading marks. Punctuation is marked (i) by high points, indicating either end of sentence (fr. 1, col. i 2: τυμπα]να·; fr. 2, 5–6 γιγνομε]]να·) or weak pause (fr. 1, col. i 4, 5, 6) and (ii) by paragraphus, also marking end of sentence (fr. 2 below 9). There is one correction (fr. 2, 16, see n.), probably in a hand and ink different from that of the main text. All these elements suggest a carefully written, 'professional' copy. The text affords no opportunity to tell whether or not iota adscript was written (cf. fr. 2, 2). Where we can tell, elision is effected tacitly (fr. 2, 1).

The text of fr. 1 overlaps with that of **4577** above.

Fr. 1

Col. i

. . . . .  
 [ . . . . . ]κας § 237  
 [γραφοντα και τα τυμπα]να· του  
 [τους δ υπογραμμ]ατ·εας και  
 [τους τυχοντας αν]θρωπους· κα[ι]  
 5 [ουδεμιας κακιας] ταυτα· αλ[λ]  
 [ου στρατηγιας γ] αξια· πρεσβε[ι]  
 [ων στρατηγιω]ν των μεχις

Col. ii

. . . . .  
 χωμ[αι του πολλα και δεινα] § 240  
 πεπ[ρεσβευσθαι σοι η σε κατα]  
 σεαυτ[ου ος γαρ ωιθηθης χρηναι]  
 τον φ[ανερον τι ποιησαι βουλη]

Fr. 2

. . . . .  
 [ . . . . . ]..[  
 [α]ν τ[α]υτ εχ[ων απερχεται δει] § 306  
 [νο]ν αυτω [τι δοξαι και δακρυ]  
 [ς]αι και οδυρ[ασθαι την Ελλαδα]

- 5    *ως κακως* [διακειται η τοιαυ]  
       *τα παθη* π[εριορα γιγνομε]  
       *να· και συν*[εβουλευεν υμιν]  
       *πεμ*[πειν τινας εις Αρκαδιαν]  
       *οιτινες κα*[τηγορησουσι των τα]  
 10    Φιλιππου π[ραττοντων ακου]  
       *ειν γαρ εφη* τ[ων φιλων ως εαν]  
       *επιστροφη*[ν η πολισ ποιηση]  
       *ται και πρεσ*[βεις πεμφη δι]  
       *[κ]ηγ εκεινο*[ι δωκουσι ταυτα]                    § 307  
 15    *μειρ* τοιωνν το[τε και μαλ ω]  
       *ανδρ*[εσ] Αθ[ηνα] [ιοι καλα και τη' πο]  
       *[λ]ε*[ι] ω' *αξ*[ι εδημηγορει επειδη]  
       [                    ] .. [                    ]  
       .                    .                    .                    .

## Fr. 1

## Col. i

5–6 αλ[λ][ου στρατηγιας γ] αξια: αλ]λ ουδε στρατηγιας αξια **4577** (fr. 11–14 col. iv). Here we supplement the text of Fuhr, which is that of S (ἀλλ' οὐ στρατηγίας γ' ἄξια (γ' in rasura)) before correction. Of the other MSS, VYP read ἀλλ' οὐδέ στρατηγίας γ' ἄξια: ἀλλ' οὐδέ γε στρατηγίας ἄξια A.

## Col. ii

2 πει[ ]: the papyrus obviously read *πεπρεβενσθαι*, with all MSS except t (*πρεβεύσασθαι*).

3 *εαντ*[ου: *εαντοῦ* AFQP: *εαντοῦ* SY. In Ptolemaic papyri, *εαντ-* is predominant in the 3rd cent. BC, becomes less frequent in the 2nd cent. and is not attested in the 1st cent. (cf. E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, i<sup>2</sup>, 2, p. 65; ii, 2, pp. 71–2). *εαντ-* is the common form used in papyri of the Roman period, whereas *εαντ-* only occurs occasionally (cf. F. T. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, ii, 168–9). Demosthenes had both forms available to him, but in Attic inscriptions of the fourth century BC *εαντ-* is more frequent than *αὔτ-* (Threatte ii. 315); if he did write *εαντ-*, Roman scribes may have regularised the orthography to the conventions of their day.

4 Col. ii seems to descend a line lower than col. i, but this impression may have been mitigated by the slant of the lines when the papyrus was complete.

## Fr. 2

2 τ[α]υτ εχ[ων: spacing shows that the papyrus read *ταῦτ' ἔχων ἀπέρχεται* with SAFY, accepted by Fuhr. PQ<sup>yp</sup> read *ἔχων ταῦτα ἄγει* ('recte puto' Blass).

16–17 The papyrus before correction read *πολει*, an original variant. *πόλειως ἄξια* is the reading of SVAYP and presumably what the papyrus finally read, after correction; *ι* was deleted with a diagonal stroke, and *ωσ* written suprascript. The article in 16 was presumably corrected at the same time. The genitive is to be preferred according to Attic usage with *ἄξιος*, the dative being reserved for persons.

M. REEVE  
T. SCHMIDT

## 4579. DEMOSTHENES, XIX 241–3, 245–6

102/30(a)

7.2 × 11 cm

Third or fourth century

Papyrus codex written in a rough informal hand of semi-documentary character, influenced by the Severe Style; there are some similarities with P. Lit. Lond. 127 (*GBEBP* no. 3b). Line divisions are uncertain and given for the front *exempli gratia*. Iota adscript not written (front 10). *Scriptio plena* (front 13). A wide column, with up to c. 40 letters; approximately 30 lines per page. Unusual variant (back 4). Initial diaereses (front 1, etc.). Punctuation by blank space coinciding with weak pause in front 6.

↓ front

· · · · ·

[τους λογους ειπεν οι κατ α]υτου νυν υ̇π[αρχουσιν α γαρ] § 241  
 [ωρισω συ δικαια οτε Τι]μαρχον εκριν[εσ ταυτα δηπου]  
 [ταυτα και κατα σου π]ροσηκει τοις [αλλοις ιςχυ]  
 [ειν ελεγεν τοιουνν τοτε] προς τους δικασ[τας οτι] § 242  
 5 [απολογησεται δε Δη]μοσθεν]ης υ̇περ αυτου [και]  
 [κατηγορησει των εμοι πε]πρες]βευμενων ειτ[εαν]  
 [υμας απαγαγη τω λογω νεανιευ]ζεσαι και περ[ιων]  
 [ερει πως τι τους δικαστας απαγ]ωγ[η] απ[ο τ]η[ς υπο]  
 [θεσεωσ ωχομην] το̇ πρ[α]γμ[α] αυτ[ων]·]φελο[μενος μη]  
 10 [συ γε αλλ υπερ ων] αγωνιζη πε[ρι το]υτων [απολο]  
 [γου τοτε δ ηνικ εκει]νον̇ εκρεινες εξην̇ ζ[οι κατηγο]  
 [ρειν και λεγειν ο τι εβου]λου αλλα μην [και επη]  
 [τοις δικασταις ελεγες ουδ]ενα μαρτυρα ε[χων εφ]  
 [οις εκρινες τον ανθρωπον παρ]αχρεσθαι [φημη]  
 15 [δ ου τις παμπαν απολλυται ηντι]να λ[αιο]

· · · · ·

→ back

· · · · ·

ουκο]υν̇ Αιςχωνη[ § 245  
 ].[ ]..[  
 προς]ηκοντως ερω ο[στις]  
 πρε]ςβευων Αιςχων[  
 5 αρ]γυριον̇ ειληφ̇ ου[τος]  
 λογο]γραφους τοιυν[υ § 246

υ]βριζειν περι[  
 ω]ν ενοχ[ος τ]αυτα μεν γ[αρ  
 Ε]υριπιδου τουτο δε το δρα[μ  
 10 ] ουτε Αριστοδημος ὑπεκ[ρι  
 λε]γων διετελεσεν α[λλ]α Μ[ολων  
 αλλ]ος των παλαιων [  
 Σοφοκλεο]υς πολλακις με[ν  
 ] ὑποκεκρι[  
 15 ] υμφερ[οντως  
 ] . . [

↓ front

7 περιών with S<sup>sc</sup>, printed by Fuhr: περιών S<sup>sc</sup>AFQP (MacDowell): περιών Y.

9 ]φελο[μενος: ὑφελόμενος SVAYP, printed by Fuhr: ἀφελόμενος P<sup>1</sup>.

10 περι SQAYP<sup>pp</sup>, printed by Fuhr: ὑπέρ FP<sup>1</sup>.

14–15 Judging from the space, the quotation of Hesiod, *Op.* 761–2 apparently began in 14 after παρασχέθαι, and continued as though prose, though it is not impossible that it began in *ekthesis* in 15, which would have produced the same alignment in 15.

15 This line overlaps with 4577 fr. 15, 1.

→ back

1 This line overlaps with 4577 fr. 16–17 col. ii 4.

3 προς]ηκοντως: και προσηκόντως SVYP, printed by Fuhr, omitted by A and Gregorius.

4 περι]ςβενων Αιςχι[ι: περιβενών Φιλοκράτει SVAYP. Presumably the papyrus read Αίςχίνηι, an odd and otherwise unattested slip.

5 εἴληφ' οὔτος SYP, printed by Fuhr: εἴληφεν οὔτος VA.

6 τουν[ν SVAYP<sup>3pp</sup>: γάρ P<sup>1</sup>.

14 ὑποκέκρινται SFQ: ὑποκρίνεται Y: ὑπεκρίνατο S<sup>pp</sup>AQ<sup>pp</sup>P (MacDowell).

D. OBBINK

### 4580. DEMOSTHENES, XIX 325

11 1B.149/H(a)

3.3 × 5.1 cm

Second/third century

Scrap from a papyrus roll with ends of ten lines. The hand is a competent if rapidly written mixed ‘Severe’ style, with no decoration and minimal shading, possibly a sign of early date. Cf. XIII 1604 (pl. I) and XV 1788 (pl. II). As usual, tiny ο, floating between the lines. Less expected is the bowl of ρ, which is slightly larger than the ο. Also unusual is the base of λ (e.g. 4), which sits at a sharp angle rather than parallel to the line of writing. The back is blank.

§ 325

[πραγμα]τ απ[ωλετο]  
 [και γαρ τ]οι παραχρη  
 [μα αντι μ]εν του Θεσπι  
 [ας και Πλα]ταιας ἴδειν  
 5 [οικιζομε]γας Ορχομε  
 [νον και Κο]ρωνειαν η  
 [κουσατ η]νδραποδι  
 [ςμενας α]ντι δε του  
 [τας Θηβας ταπ]ε[ι]γας  
 10 [γενεσθαι και περι]αιρε

3 After του a space.

7-8 ηνδραποδι|ςμενας is required by the space in the papyrus, in concurrence with SVY and printed by Fuhr, who compares Demosth. III 20: ἐξηνδραποδιςμένας AP.

D. OBBINK

### III. ORACULAR TEXTS

#### 4581. *SORTES ASTRAMPSYCHI*

63 6B.69/K(3-5)a  
+ 70/B(1-2)a  
+ 70/E(1)-(3)

Largest fr. 34.5 × 27 cm

Fifth/sixth century

Plate III

These fragments from a codex of the *Sortes Astrampsychi* constitute a unique and significant addition to the growing number of papyrus witnesses to this popular oracular text. The previously published papyri of the *Sortes* are XII **1477**, first identified correctly by G. Björck, *Symb. Osl.* 19 (1939) 97, and re-edited by G. M. Browne, *The Papyri of the Sortes Astrampsychi* (Beitr. z. klass. Phil. 58 (1974) 17–28), XXXVIII **2832** and **2833** (re-edited by Browne, *The Papyri of the Sortes Astrampsychi*, 30–63), XLVII **3330**, P. Gent inv. 85 (W. Clarysse and R. Stewart, *CE* 63 (1988) 309–314), P. Iand. V 71 and P. Rain. I 33 (both re-edited by J. Lenaerts, *CE* 58 (1983) 191–195; treated once again in R. Stewart, *ZPE* 69 (1987) 237–242), P. Lugd. Bat. XXV 8, and P. Berol. inv. 21341 as well as 21358 (*Ancient Magic and Ritual Power*, ed. M. Meyer and P. Mirecki (Leiden 1995), 221–231).

The codex is written in an upright semi-documentary hand. Iota adscript is not written and the orthography is characterised by frequent iotacisms. There are no surviving page numbers. Leaves 4a–b and 5a–b are conjugate; 2a–b and 3a–b were consecutive, and may also be conjugate. The latter relationship, if verifiable, would be important for the structure of the codex, but the physical condition of the surface does not allow confirmation. Though no leaf survives complete, reconstruction argues that the measurement of each leaf was approximately 18 centimetres in breadth by 28 centimetres in height, placing the codex in Turner's Group 5 (*The Typology of the Early Codex* 16–18). The papyrus contains only portions of the decades of answers, which comprise the bulk of the *Sortes*. The decades are not prefaced with the name of a divinity, numen, or religious figure, such as we find in P. Berol. 21341 and 21358 as well as in the table of correspondences preserved in P. Lugd. Bat. XXV 8 and in the medieval manuscripts. The decade number, bordered by supra- and infralinear bars, stands just to the left of the first answer in each decade. The individual answers are not numbered, but elaborate paragraphoi separate the decades. Some responses are continued, with indentation, on a second line, e.g., 67.8 and 96.1. Occasionally the scribe wrote the final few letters of a response in the interlinear space above the last word rather than begin a new line, e.g.,  $\chi\rho\sigma\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\phi\omega'$  (118.1) and  $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\grave{\epsilon}\tau\omega'$  (119.7).

Besides presenting important evidence for the transmission of the text, this papyrus preserves additional decades of answers not found in any of the medieval manuscripts or other papyri. That these decades (= leaves 5a–8b), numbered to at least 208, were an appendage to and not an integral part of the archetypal formulation of the *Sortes Astrampsychi* is attested by the fact that the responses in them are to questions different from those an-



swered in the first 103 decades and that no responses to these otherwise unattested questions appear in the earlier decades. It seems that someone simply added to the basic text additional questions and their corresponding answers, producing a book of fate at least slightly more than twice as long as the original version.

The responses in fragments 5a–8b and the sequence in which they appear within the decades, especially the arrangement of multiple answers to the same query, allow a conjectural reconstruction of the order and wording of some of the questions that comprised this addition to the known text. The table overleaf lists those questions that can be at least partially restored and/or whose relative order can be ascertained. All questions in each group below, as designated by the initial lower case letter of its assigned number, would have appeared in the same sequence in the original list of questions in our text as they are given below. However, because of the way the decades of answers in the *Sortes Astrampsychi* were shuffled in composition (see Browne, *BICS* 17 (1970) 95–100), we cannot be certain that group c preceded group b or that group b came ahead of group d, etc. The letters below simply divide groups of contiguous answers and are not intended to suggest the order of these groups.

Responses that both cannot be read and cannot be placed within a sequence of identifiable responses (e.g., 171.1–10 and 172.1–4) have not been assigned a group number and, hence, do not appear in this list, since they may not, in fact, be answers to questions not already otherwise numbered, but rather additional responses to questions that can be recovered and/or placed within a sequence.

Obvious parallels between the Latin *Sortes Sangallenses* and the standard text of the *Sortes Astrampsychi* are plentiful, see H. Winnefeld, *Sortes Sangallenses* (Bonn 1887) and J. Rendel Harris, *The Annotators of the Codex Bezae* (Cambridge 1901). The parallels that also exist between this addendum to the known text of the *Sortes Astrampsychi* and the *Sortes Sangallenses* are delineated in the commentaries below. In at least one instance the parallel between these texts may illuminate the meaning of a difficult passage in the *Sortes Astrampsychi* (see note on 6b.5).

R. Stewart, ‘The Textual Transmission of the *Sortes Astrampsychi*’, *Illinois Classical Studies* 11 (1995) 135–147 has argued that it is incorrect to view the so-called first and second editions of the *Sortes Astrampsychi* as separate versions which circulated in antiquity. Here it is sufficient to restate two points only: (1) all papyri of the *Sortes* published to date, inclusive of the fragments below, appear to antedate the production of the shorter version; (2) the shorter version, known as the first edition (G. M. Browne (ed.), *Sortes Astrampsychi*, i: *Ecdosis prior* (Leipzig 1983)), though it is of all the extant witnesses the most faithful to the archetype syntactically, must have been produced in an ingenious attempt to make serviceable once again a manuscript of the original and longer version (known as the second edition) from which the table of correspondences was missing (R. Stewart (ed.), *Sortes Astrampsychi*, ii: *Ecdosis altera* (Leipzig 2000)); this ‘second’ edition preserves, for the most part, the structure of the archetype. Consequently, below the transcript of these fragments, we give in the second apparatus—the first is diplomatic—the variant readings of both the ‘first’ (A) and

TABLE 3. Questions and answers in the new decades of the Sortes Astrampsychi

Assigned number in this edition	Question	Responses in these fragments (decade nos.)	
c1	εἰ ἐκδίδωμι τὸ παιδίον πρὸς . . . ;		175.1
c2	εἰ . . . ἦν θέλω . . . ;		175.2
c3	εἰ παιδεύω . . . ;		175.3
c4	εἰ δέδοται μοι . . . ;		175.4
c5	εἰ ἔχω . . . ;		175.5
c6	εἰ συμφέρει μοι δανείσασθαι;	118.1	175.6
c7	εἰ εὐκαρπῆσει τὸ χωρίον;	118.2	175.7
c8	εἰ ἔχω ἰδεῖν τὴν ἀδελφήν;	118.3	175.8
c9	εἰ ἐφορῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς;	118.4	175.9
c10	εἰ προτελευτῶ τῆς γυναικός (μου);	117.1	118.5 175.10
c11	εἰ πλέω ἢ πεζεύω;	117.2	118.6
c12	irrecoverable	117.3	118.7
c13	εἰ θορυβοῦμαι . . . ;	117.4	118.8
c14	εἰ . . . ἐν τῷ ὀφθικίῳ(?);	117.5	118.9
c15	εἰ ἀπολαμβάνω . . . ;	117.6	118.10
c16	irrecoverable	117.7	
c17	irrecoverable	117.8	
c18	irrecoverable	117.9	
c19	εἰ . . . κρείττονα(?);	117.10	
			(172.1–4 irrecoverable)
b1	εἰ πλέω εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν;	116.1	172.5
b2	εἰ ἔσομαι ἀρχιατρός;	116.2	172.6
b3	εἰ λαμβάνω . . . ;	116.3	172.7
b4	εἰ μετοικῶ;	116.4	172.8
b5	εἰ ἐπιτεύξομαι καλοῦ γάμου;	116.5	172.9
b6	εἰ δῶσω (οἱ δίδωμι) . . . ;	116.6	172.10
b7	εἰ ὁ νῆός μου ῥήτωρ δύνα[ται γενέσθαι];	116.7	
b8	εἰ πορεύομαι . . . ;	116.8	
b9	εἰ ναυλῶ . . . ;	116.9	
b10	εἰ παραμένω ἦν θέλω [γυναῖκα?]	116.10	
d1	εἰ . . . ἐκ τῆς φίλης μου;	119.1	
d2	εἰ συμφέρει μοι στρατεύσασθαι;	119.2	173.1
d3	εἰ ἐπιτεύξομαι ἐπὶ γήρους;	119.3	173.2
d4	εἰ συμφέρει . . . ;	119.4	173.3
d5	εἰ ἔχω . . . τὸν ἀδελφόν μου;	119.5	173.4
d6	irrecoverable	119.6	173.5
d7	εἰ ὑποπτεύω . . . ;	119.7	173.6
d8	εἰ πᾶσχω . . . ;	119.8	173.7
d9	εἰ ἀπελεύσομαι(?). . . ;	119.9	173.8?

Assigned number in this edition	Question	Responses in these fragments (decade nos.)
d10	irrecoverable	119.10
e1	irrecoverable	174.6
e2	εἰ τηρήσομαι τὴν . . . ;	174.7(?) x. 1 (8b, line 5)
e3	εἰ ὄψομαι τοὺς ἐμούς;	174.8(?) x. 2 (8b, line 6)
e4	εἰ ἀπολυθήσομαι τῆς λειτουργίας;	174.9 x. 3 (8b, lines 7–8)
e5	εἰ ἀνακαθήμι(?) τὸ πρόσωπον;	174.10 x. 4 (8b, line 9)
e6	εἰ διαλλάσσομαι . . . ;	x. 5 (8b, line 10)
Groups of contiguous questions with only one identifiable answer		
a1	εἰ (νῦν?) συμφέρει μοι . . . ;	115.9
a2	εἰ ὁ ἀ[πόδημος?] προκόπτει;	115.10
f1	εἰ καταδέδεκε ἡ φίλη . . . ;	176.1
f2	εἰ φάρμακος ἔστιν ἦν . . . γυναῖκα . . . ;	176.2
g1	εἰ ἔχω διαβληθῆναι . . . ;	207.5
g2	irrecoverable	207.6
g3	εἰ ὄψονται . . . ;	207.7
g4	irrecoverable	207.8
g5	εἰ ἔχουσι χρόνον . . . ;	207.9
g6	εἰ στρατεύουσι (or στρατεύω) . . . ;	207.10
h1	εἰ ἔχουσιν . . . ;	208.1
h2	irrecoverable	208.2
h3	εἰ στρατευ-(?) . . . ;	208.3
h4	irrecoverable	208.4
h5	irrecoverable	208.5
h6	εἰ προγυμνάζω(?) . . . ;	208.6
h7	εἰ δανείζω(?) . . . ;	208.7
h8	εἰ νοσῶ . . . ;	208.8
h9	εἰ συμφέρει . . . ;	208.9
h10	irrecoverable	208.10

the ‘second’ (p) editions as well as those of the parallel papyri, namely, XXXVIII **2832** for decades 65.8–67.6–10 and **2833** for decades 73–74.4.

One mark of the ‘second’ edition is the addition of short comments and adverbial extensions to the responses, such as *κατὰ μέρος* (66.7) and *ἀλλὰ θάρρει* (96.8). When such additions are cited in the apparatus, they are introduced not by a lemma but by a plus sign (+) and are to be understood as coming at the end of the given reading.

Some preliminary remarks on this papyrus were made by G. M. Browne in *Arktouros: Hellenic Studies presented to Bernard M. W. Knox* (1979) 434–9.

1a

→	[οὐκ ἀγοράζει]ι[ς ὁ ἐνθυμείσαι]	84
	~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	
	[λ οὐ λήμ]ψη [ἄ]ρτι τὸ ἀργύριον	79
	[λαμ]βάνεις κομ[ι]ᾶτον	78
	[ἀποκαθί]ςτᾶσαι εἰς τ[ὸν] τόπον[ν]	77
5	[οὐ δύνῃ] ἐτέρω συναλλάξαι	76
	[.]ητη.....ς	75?
	[ c. 10 ]ρ...μ...[.]	74?
	[ὄπου ὑπάγεις ο]ὐ μένεις	73
	[λαμβάνεις τὸ] ὀψώνιον	72
10	[λαμβάνεις τὴν παραθή]κην	71

3 1. λαμβάνεις      8 1. μένεις

1 ἀγοράζεις ὁ ἐνθυμείσαι (+ ἐὰν θέλεις p) Ap      2-10 30.1-9 in A legi non possunt      2 λαμβάνεις p  
 3 κομητᾶτον καμάτω πολλῶ p      4 ἀποκαθίςτᾶσαι εἰς τὸν τόπον σου p      5 οὐ δύνασαι p      6 οὐκ  
 ὠφέλῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ φίλου οὐδέν p      7 οὐ πωλῆ ἄρτι οὐ γὰρ συμφέρι σοι p      8 οὐ μένεις ὄπου ὑπάγεις p  
 10 οὐκ ἀπολαμβάνεις p

1 You will not buy the thing you have in mind      2 You will not get the money just yet  
 3 You will get furlough      4 You will be restored to your place      5 You will not be able to have dealings with another  
 6 ...      7 ...      8 You will not remain where you are going  
 9 You will get the salary      10 You will get your deposit back

Due to the much faded and highly lacunose state of this piece many letter-traces on it cannot be read with certainty.

3 κομητᾶτον (= Latin *comiteatus*) occurs in A, **1477** ii 7, **2832** 22, 33 and as a variant in the margin of E at question 78. κομητᾶτον (= Latin *comitatum*) is found in question 78 and all of its responses in p. In these fragments, 2a, lines 11 (dec. 66.8) and 23 (dec. 67.9) are further responses to question 78.

5 [οὐ δύνῃ]: δύνασαι is also a possible restoration, but the negative response is the reading of p.

6-7 The ink remains do not allow the reading of p or any of its variants to be recovered.

1b

↓	[οὐ]κ ἀγοράζ[εις χωρίον]	99
	[οὐ] παραμ[ένει σοι ἡ φίλη]	98
	οὐ παραμ[ένει]ς [σοι ἡ πρ]ώ[τη γυνή]	97
	ἀπαλλάσσει [τῆς φίλης]	96

5	γίνῃ δεκάπρωτος	95
	οὐ δύνασαι ἰδῆν τήν πατρίδα]	94
	οὐκ ἀπαρτίζεις ὃ ἐπιβάλλῃ]	93
	ο[ὐ] λαμβάν[εις λη]γ[άτον]	92
	πεφαρμάκω[σαι. σεαυτῶ βοήθει]	91
	~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	
10	λγ [οὐ] κα[ταλλάσσει τοῖς κυρίοις]	46
	[μ]ῆ δ[ίδου τὰ γράμματα ἄρτι]	45

6 l. ἰδεῖν      7 l. ἀπαρτίζεις

1 + οἰκίαν p      2 coi ἢ φίλη] σου ὁ πάληξ (sic) A οὐ παραμένεις πρεσβύτερος p      4 τῆς φίλης] τοῦ κλήρου p οὐ συγκροτεῖται ἀπὸ τοῦ φίλου A      5 οὐ γίνῃ A οὐ δεκαπρωτεῖς ἄρτι p      6 οὐ θεωρεῖς τὴν πατρίδα A οὐ δύνῃ ἄρτι τὴν πατρίδα ἰδεῖν p      8 + μὴ προσδόκα p      9 εαυτῶ A      10 διαλλάσσει p      11 δῶς p

1 You will not buy land      2 Your girl friend will not remain with you      3 Your first wife will not stay with you      4 You will be separated from your girl friend      5 You will become a decemvir      6 You will not be able to see your homeland      7 You will not finish what you intend      8 You will not get a bequest      9 You have been poisoned. Get help for yourself      10 You will not come to terms with your masters      11 Do not deliver your document just yet

2 Restored on the basis of 2b.17 (69.7) and 3b.9 (73.2), which indicate that question 98 in this papyrus must have concurred with the reading of A: εἰ παραμένει μοι ἢ φίλη; In p, Christian interpolation has altered the query to εἰ παραμένω πρεσβύτερος;

4 Cf. 2b.19 (69.9) and **2832** 7 (οὐκ ἀπαλλάσσει τῆς φίλης []). In p, question 96 has been altered to εἰ ἀπαλλάσσομαι τοῦ κλήρου; In A, the question is εἰ συγκροτοῦμαι ἀπὸ τοῦ φίλου; The original question must have been εἰ ἀπαλλάσσομαι τῆς φίλης;

9 Cf. 2a.1 (65.8) and 3b.16 (73.9). Question 91 in A is εἰ φαρμακοῦμαι; and εἰ πεφαρμάκωσαι; in p. In the decades of answers, the manuscripts of p freely interchange forms of φαρμακάω, φαρμακόω, and φαρμακεύω.

2a

→	[πεφαρμ]άκευσαι. ἀσφαλίζου	91
	[οὐκ ἀπα]λλάσσει τῆς γυνεκός	90
	[λ]αῖθάνι σου ὁ δρασμός	89
	~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	
[ξ]ς	[γί]νη βιό[π]ρ[ατος] τῆλε[ίως]	85
5	οὐκ ἀγοράζεις ὃ ἐνθυμῆ	84
	εὐρίσκεις πωλῆσαι ἐπὶ κέρδη	83

	π[ρο]γράφαιται τὰ κά. ἕτερα κτή[ς]	82
	κερδένης ἀπὸ τοῦ πράγματος	81
	ζῆ [ὄ] ἀπόδημος καὶ ἔρχαιτε	80
10	λαμβάνεις τὸ ἀργύριον	79
	[οὐ] λαμβάνει[ς] κ[ομιᾶτον]	78
	οὐκ [ἀπ]ο[καθίστασαι εἰς τὸν τόπον]	77
	[ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ]	76?
	[ξζ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ]	86?
15	[ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ]	85?
	[ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ]	84?
	[ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ]	83?
	[ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ]	82?
	κερδένης ἀπὸ τοῦ [πράγματος]	81
20	ζῆ ὄ ἀπόδημος κ[αὶ ἔρχεται]	80
	λαμβάνεις τὸ ἀργύριον	
	κατὰ μέρος	79
	οὐ λαμβάνεις κομ[ιᾶτον]	78
	οὐκ ἀποκαθίστασαι [εἰς τὸν τόπον]	77
	~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	

2 l. γυναικός      3 l. λανθάνει      5 l. ἀγοράζεις      6 l. εὐρίσκεις, κέρδει      7 l. προγράφεται  
 8 l. κερδαίνεις      9 l. ἔρχεται      10 l. λαμβάνεις      11 l. λαμβάνεις      19 l. κερδαίνεις  
 21 l. λαμβάνεις      23 l. λαμβάνεις

1 ἀσφαλίζου] ἐαυτῶ βοήθησον A σεαυτῶ βοήθει p      2 + ποτε p οὐ καταλλάσσει τῇ γυναικί A οὐ κατ[ **2832**  
 3 + πρὸς ὀλίγον p      4 οὐ γείνη (sic) **2832** βιοπράτης A βιόπραγος p      τελείως om. p      5 ἐνθυμίσαι A  
 + οὐ γὰρ συμφέρει p      6 ἐπὶ κέρδη] μετὰ κέρδους A πωλεῖς καὶ κερδαίνεις πολὺ p      7 ἕτερα κτή[ς] ἄλλα  
 κερδήσεις A ἄλλα κτή[ς] p      8 κερδήσεις A + ὀλίγον p      9 + ὑγιαίνων p      10 οὐ λαμβάνεις A **2832**  
 + κατὰ μέρος p      11 οὐ om. A **2832** κομητᾶτον ἄρτι p      12 οὐκ ἀφίστασαι ἀπὸ τοῦ τόπου A + σου p  
 19 + πολὺ p      20 οὐ ζῆ ὄ ἀπόδημος οὐκ ἔρχεται p      22 κατὰ μέρος] κατὰ μόνος A ἄρτι p      23 οὐ  
 om. A      κομητᾶτον νῦν p      24 οὐκ ἀποκαθίστασαι] καθίστασαι A + σου A

1 You have been poisoned. Take care      2 You will not be separated from your wife  
 3 Your flight will escape detection      4 You will be sold into utter slavery      5 You will  
 not buy what you desire      6 You will be able to sell at a profit      7 Your belongings  
 will be sold at auction. You will acquire others      8 You will profit from the undertaking  
 9 The traveller is alive and will return      10 You will get the money      11 You will not  
 get furlough      12 You will not be restored to your place      13–18 . . .      19 You will  
 profit from the undertaking      20 The traveller is alive and will return      21–2 You will

get the money in part 23 You will not get furlough 24 You will not be restored to your place

2a–b and 3a–b are adjacent leaves, as the decade numbers show. The surface condition has not allowed us to confirm if the horizontal fibres are continuous from 3b to 2a, i.e. that the two leaves are conjugate.

<sup>1</sup> See commentary on 1b.9 above.

<sup>2</sup> Question 90 in both A and p is *εὶ ἀπαλλάσσομαι τῆς γυναικός*; In many of the responses scribal confusion has changed *οὐκ ἀπαλλάσσει* to *οὐ καταλλάσσει* with subsequent compensatory alteration of the predicate from genitive to dative.

<sup>4</sup> I restore *βί[π]ρ[α]τος* on the somewhat uncertain basis of 3b.1 below, which is also a response to question 85. Browne reads this question in **1477** 14 as *εὶ γίνομαι βίόπρατος*; and argues in his accompanying note that *βίόπρατος* is a variant of, rather than a mistake for, *βίόπραγος*, which is the operative word of question 85 and its responses in p (*The Papyri of the Sortes Astrampyschi*, 20, 26–27). Besides **2832** 26, cited in the secondary apparatus above, the only other response to question 85 in the papyri is P. Iand. 5.71.6 (decade 81.6): [*γίνη β]ιόπρατος [τελείωσ].*

2b

↓	[ξη	οὐ κλ]η[ρονομεῖ]ς τὸν πατέρα	33
		[ἐλευ]θερ[οῦ]σαι ἐν τῇ πραγμα[τεία]	32
		[οὐκ ἔ]χ[ει]ς ὑβρισθῆναι	31
		[χώζ]εται τὸ γεννηθέν	30
5		[χώ]ζη τ[ῆ]ς κατη[γορ]ίας	29
		[δ]ώση[ς] ἄρτι [τοὺς] λόγ[ους]	28
		[ἔρ]χεται ὁ ἀπ[όδημ]ο[ς] χ[ρο]νίας	27
		[ο]ὐκ ἀποδίδι[ς] ἄρτι ἃ ὀφίλ[εις]	26
		[δ]ανίζη. βραδέως δ[ε] ἀποδ[ίδει]	25
10		[τί]κτι καὶ τ[ὸ γ]εννώμενον [	24
		~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	
	[ξθ	οὐ] πλεῖς γῆν	12
		[ἀπολύ]α[ιται] ὁ συν[ε]χόμε[νος]	103
		[οὐ κατ]α[λ]λάσσει τ[ῆ] γυν[αικί]	102
		[ . . . c. 10 . . . ] [ἔρο]νίκ[ης]	101
15		[οὐ καταλ]αμ[βάν]η μ[οιχός]	100
		[ἀγορά]ζεις χ]ω[ρ]ό[ν] ἢ ἰκί[αν]	99
		[παραμένει] σοι ἢ φίλη	98
		[παραμένει] σοι ἢ γυνή	97
		[ἀπαλλάσσει] τῆς φίλης	96
20		[γίνη] δεκ[ά]πρωτος	95
		~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	

[ο     ρώζῃ τῆς ἀ]θενίας     42  
 [οὐ σοφικ]τεύσης. ἄλλο τι πρ[άτ]τε     41

6 l. δώσεις     8 l. ἀποδίδεις, ὀφείλεις     9 l. δανείζῃ     10 l. τίκτει     12 l. ἀπολύεται  
 14 l. ἰσχύειν     16 l. οἰκίαν     21 l. ἀσθενείας     22 l. σοφιστεύσεις

1 οὐ om. A     + οὐ μόνος A     2 οὐκ ἐλευθεροῦσαι ἄρτι (+ μὴ προσδόκα p) Ap     3 οὐχ ὑβρίζῃ  
 μὴ φοβοῦ (+ μάλλον χαίρου p) Ap     4 + μετὰ καμάτου p     5 + παρακλήσει p     6 δίδεις A δίδωσ  
 p ἄρτι om. Ap     + μεθ' ὕβρεως A + σου δωρεάν p     7 χρονίαις] βραδέως A + χαίρου p     8 ἄρτι ἃ  
 ὀφείλεις] νῦν ὃ ὀφείλεις A ἃ ὀφείλεις ἄρτι p + ἀλλὰ μετὰ ταῦτα p     9 δὲ ἀποδίδεις] εὐρών A παρ' οὐ θέλεις p  
 10 τὸ γεννώμενον οὐ τρέφεται A γεννώμενον ἄχρηστον ἔσται p     11 οὐ om. p     ὁ συνεχόμενος ἀποθνήσκει  
 (quod ad quaestionem 103 quadrat) A     12 + νῦν p οὐκ ἔχεις ἱερατεῦσαι (quod ad ecclōsis prioris quaestionem  
 101 interpolatione Christiana mutatam quadrat) A; vide responsum 3 in A: ἀπολύεται ὁ συνεχόμενος     13 οὐ  
 om. p + μετὰ χρόνον p οὐ καταλλάσσει τῇ γυναικί A (responsum 4)     14 οὐκ ἔχεις γένεσιν ἐπισκόπου μὴ ἔλπιζε  
 p (quod ad quaestionem 101 interpolatione Christiana mutatam quadrat) οὐκ ἰσχύεις ἱερατεῦσαι A (responsum  
 5)     15 καταλαμβάνεται ἐὰν μὴ σπεύσῃς A (responsum 6, quod ad quaestionem interpolatam εἰ καταλαμβάνο-  
 μαι ὑπὸ ἄρχοντος; quadrat)     16 χωρίον ἢ οἰκίαν] ἀλλὰ μετὰ κόπου A (responsum 7)     17 σοὶ ἢ φίλῃ]  
 σοὶ ἢ γυνῆ σου κοφρονοῦσα p ὃ πάλληξ A (responsum 8)     18 οὐ παραμένει p σου A (responsum 9) + φίλον  
 ἔχει p     19 + ζηλώσας p οὐ συγκροτεῖται ἀπὸ τοῦ φίλου A (responsum 10)     20 + ποτε p     22 οὐχ  
 ὑπάγεις ἀλλαχοῦ δὲ ὑπάγεις A (quod ad quaestionem 41, quae interpolatione in ecclōse priore mutata est, quadrat)

1 You will not inherit from your father     2 You will be freed in the matter     3 You  
 are not able to be harmed     4 The baby will survive     5 You will be safe from the  
 accusation     6 You will give an accounting soon     7 The traveller will return after  
 some time     8 You will not pay back the sums you owe just yet     9 You will borrow  
 but will repay it slowly     10 She will give birth and the child . . .     11 You will not sail  
 now     12 The one who is detained will be set free     13 You will not be reconciled with  
 your wife     14 . . . a victor in the games     15 You will not be caught as an adulterer  
 16 You will buy land or a house     17 Your girl friend will remain with you     18 Your  
 wife will remain with you     19 You will be separated from your girl friend     20 You  
 will become a decemvir     21 You will recover from your illness     22 You will not be  
 a rhetorician. Do something else

2 There is not enough space before ]θερ[ for the negative οὐκ, which is the reading of both A and p.

10 The response may have ended with τρέφεται or ζῆ.

11 Decade 69 has different identities in A and p. In the latter, it is unshuffled decade 115, offering fake responses in slots 1 through 9 and a genuine response to question 95 in slot 10. In A, it is unshuffled decade 106, meaning its first three responses are fakes and slots 4–10 contain genuine answers to questions 102–96 respectively. In this papyrus, the decade follows the pattern of p, hence providing evidence, as I have argued elsewhere (*Illinois Classical Studies* 11 (1995) 135–147) that A results from an attempt to reconstruct a defective manuscript that had the same arrangement of the *Sortes* as that preserved in p. Inasmuch, then, as decade 69 in A derives ultimately from the same exemplar as decade 69 in p and was formed by the mere downward shift of the answers by one slot and the addition of fake responses to the top of the decade, I give the relevant readings of A in the secondary apparatus above.

14 Question 101 in p is εἰ γίνομαι ἐπίσκοπος; In A, it is εἰ γίνομαι ἱερατικός; Cf. 4a.9 (93.9), implying that the original form of the question was εἰ γίνομαι ἱερονίκης; The only other response to question 101 in the papyri is



P. Iand. V 71.7 at decade 82.7, but the fragment offers only ]κ ἔζη πολλ[. On the basis of the responses here and the answers for 82.7 in A and p, R. Stewart restored the line in P. Iand. as [ἱερονίκης οὐ]κ ἔζη πολλ[ἄ ἀγωνισάμενος]; see *ZPE* 69 (1987) 238.

19 On question 96, see commentary on 1b.4 above

3a

↓	[εὐρ]ίςκικ τὸ ἀπολλόμενο[ν]	40
	[φιλ]οπώνικον καὶ ὠφελ[ῆ]	39?
	[ἔχ]εῖς ὠφέλιαν τοῦ πράγμ[α]τος	38?
	[ἔχ]εῖς ἐσχάτην καλήν	37
5	[οὐ]χ εὐρίσκικ τὸν φυγόντα	36
	ἄρξῃ ἐνδόξωσ	35
	κληρονομίς τήν μητέρα	34
	οὐ κληρονομίς τὸν πατέρα	33
	~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	
	[ο]α τίκτι μετὰ κινδύνου	24
10	κινῆ ἐκ τοῦ τόπου	23
	[β]λά[πτῃ], ἑτέρω δ[ε] κερδέ[νεις]	22
	[γ]αμ[εῖς] ἦν θέλις καὶ οἶδα[ς γυναι]κα	21
	[οὐ]κ [ἀγορά]ζεις τ[ὸ] προκί[μ]ε[ν]ον	20
	[ε]ὐτυχή[ς] ἐπ' ἔσχ[άτων]	19
15	[ς]υναλλάσσει καὶ κ[ερδα]ίνεις	18
	ἀποδημήσεις ἐ[ξ]απίνης	17
	οὐ προκόπτεις ἄρτι	16
	ἐὰν κοινωνί[ς]ις, β[λάπτῃ]	15
	~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	
	οβ γίνῃ βουλευτή	88
20	πρέσβευσθ[ν]. ἔτοιμ[άζου]	87
	οὐ φυγαδεύ[ῃ]. μὴ [φοβοῦ]	86

1 I. εὐρίσκεις, ἀπολλόμενον 2 I. φιλοπότηνον 3 I. ὠφέλιαν 5 I. εὐρίσκεις 7-8 I. κληρονομίς 9 I. τίκτει 11 I. κερδαίνεις 12 I. θέλις 13 I. προκείμενον 14 I. εὐτυχήσεις  
15 I. συναλλάσσει 16 I. ἀποδημήσεις 17 I. προκόπτεις 18 I. κοινωνήσεις

1 + ταχὺ καὶ χαίρη p 2 ἀγορανομίς καὶ ὠφελῆ πολὺ p γίνῃ πρεσβύτερος καὶ εὐήμερῆς A 3 κληρονομίς τὸν φίλον ἐξ ἡμερίας p οὐ κληρονομίς τὸν φίλον A 4 οὐκ ἔχεις A + μόνον εὔχου p 5 οὐχ εὐρίσκεις] οὐχ εὐρήσεις A εὐρήσεις ἄρτι p 6 ἄρξεις καὶ εὐημερήσεις (+ καὶ δοξάζῃ p) Ap 7 οὐ κληρονομίς p + ἄλλω ἀπόκειται p 8 οὐ om. p + μόνος p 10 + ἄφνω ἐπὶ τὸ κρείττον p 11 βλάπτῃ ἐν τούτῳ p ἑτέρω δὲ κερδένεις] ἄλλοθεν δὲ κερδαίνεις A ἐν δὲ τῷ ἑτέρω ὠφελῆ p 12 καὶ οἶδας om. A γαμήσειν ἔχεις ἐπὶ καλῶ σου ἐὰν σπύσει p 13 + οὐκ ἐπαρκείς p 14 ἐπ' ἐσχάτων] εἰς τὰ ἔσχατα

A + καὶ οἰκοδεσποτεῖς p 15 συνάλλαξον A κερδήσεις A + διὰ τῶν ἀλλοτριῶν p 16 ἀποδ-  
 ημεῖς Ap ἐξαίφνης A + καὶ κερδαίνεις p 17 + μὴ ἔλιπε p 18 + πολὺ p 19 οὐ γίνῃ Ap  
 20 πρεσβεύεις A οὐ πρεσβεύεις μόνος οὐ γὰρ συμφέρει σοι p

1 You will find what is lost 2 Work diligently and you will benefit 3 You will have a profit from the affair 4 You will have a good end 5 You will not find the fugitive 6 You will hold office with honour 7 You will inherit from your mother 8 You will not inherit from your father 9 She will give birth with peril 10 You will move from your place 11 You will be harmed, but in another matter you will benefit 12 You will marry a woman whom you desire and know 13 You will not purchase what is offered 14 You will succeed at last 15 You will come to an agreement and profit 16 You will go away suddenly 17 You will not advance just yet 18 If you share in the business, you will suffer 19 You will be a councillor 20 Become an ambassador. Prepare yourself 21 You will not be banished. Do not be afraid

2 Question 39 in p is *εἰ ἀγορανομήσω*; In A, the question itself is illegible, but all of the genuine answers in the text respond to *εἰ γίνομαι πρεσβύτερος*; That p preserves the archetypal form of the query is attested both by the answer to this question in decade 21.2 that is preserved in P. Gent inv. 85,8 as *οὐκ ἀγορανομεῖς ἄρτι* and the fake answer at 98.7 in A, which reads *ἀγορανομεῖς καὶ εὐήμερεῖς* (the fake answers in A antedate Christian interpolations). It is difficult to construe this line as an answer to either the original form or the interpolated form of the question. That the next line is also problematic suggests that the text at this point either is corrupt or preserves forms of questions 38 and 39 not otherwise attested.

3 The answer does not appear to be a response to question 38 (*εἰ κληρονομῶ τοὺς γονεῖς*), as the structure of the decade demands, nor does it appear to be a standard response to any of the other known questions in the *Sortes*. While *ἔχεις ὠφέλειαν* is found frequently in both A and p in the responses to question 75 (*εἰ ὠφελοῦμαι ἀπὸ τοῦ φίλου*; A *εἰ ἔχω ὄφελος ἀπὸ τοῦ φίλου*; p), it does not occur in conjunction with (*ἀπὸ*) τοῦ πράγματος, which regularly appears in answers to question 81 (*εἰ κερδαίνω [κερδανῶ p] ἀπὸ τοῦ πράγματος*; Ap).

6 The middle voice in a parallel answer in 4b.8 (96.4) below militates against the temptation to emend *ἄρξῃ* to the active voice to put it in conformity with the verbal form of all answers to question 35 (*εἰ ἄρξω ἐν τῷ πράγματι*); in all other witnesses.

3b

→	[γίνῃ βι]όπρατος	85
	[ἀγόραζε] ὁ ἐνθυμῆ	84
	[εὐρίσκει]ς πωλήσαι	83
	[προγρά]φετε τὰ κά	82
5	[κερδαίνει]ς ἀπὸ τοῦ πράγματος	81
	[ζῆ ὁ ἀπ]όδημος καὶ ἔρχαιται	80
	[οὐ λαμβ]άνεις ἄρτι τὸ ἀργύριον	79
	~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	
	[ογ ἀγο]ράζεις ἄρτι ο[ῦ]δέν	99
	[πα]ραμένι σοι ἢ φίλη	98

10	[οὐ π]α[ραμ]ένε σοι ἢ πρῶ[τη γ]υνή	97
	[οὐ]κ ἀπαλλάσσει [τῆς φίλης]	96
	[γίν]η δεκάπρωτο[ς]	95
	[ἔχεις] τὴν πατρίδα [θεωρήσαι]	94
	[ἀπαρτ]ίξι[ς] ὃ ἐπιβ[άλλη]	93
15	[λαμβά]νι[ς] λ]ηγάτ[ο]ν ὀλίγο[ν]	92
	[οὐ πεφαρμ]άκωσαι, ἀλλὰ ἀτυχίς	91
	[οὐκ ἔχεις τ]ῆς γυνεκός ἀπαλλαγῆνέ'	90
	~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	
[οδ	οὐ νόζη τῆ]ς κυκοφαντίας	53
	[κληρονομεί]ς τὴν γυναῖκα	52
20	[εἰπέ τὴν δ]ίκην. νικάς	51
	[οὐ μένει σο]ν τὰ ὑπάρχοντα	50

4 l. προγράφεται 6 l. ἔρχεται 7 l. λαμβάνεις 8 l. ἀγοράζεις 9, 10 l. παραμένει  
15 l. λαμβάνεις 16 l. ἀτυχίς 17 l. γυναικός, ἀπαλλαγῆναι 19 γυνεκα pap.

1 οὐ γίνη Ap βιοπράτης A βιόπραγος τὸ εὐνολον p 2 ἐνθυμηθῆς A ἀγοράζεις ὃ ἐνθυμείσαι καὶ μετα-  
νοεῖς p 3 + καλῶς A + βραδέως p 4 + ἀλλ' οὐδὲν κτήρη A + πρόσεχε p 5 οὐ κερδαίνεις A +  
καμέ p 6 ἔρχεται ὁ ἀπόδημος μετὰ φίλου καλοῦ p 7 ἄρτι om. p + ὄλον p τὸ ἀργύριον βραδὺ ἀπολήψη  
A 8 οὐκ ἀγοράζεις Ap ἄρτι om. p οὐδέν] χωρίον A χωρίον ἢ οἰκίαν p 9 σοι om. A ἢ φίλη]  
ὁ πάληξ (sic) A παραμένεις πρεσβύτερος ἕως γήρωσ p 10 σοι om. Ap ἢ πρώτη γυνή] ἢ γυνή σου μοιχᾶται  
p 11 οὐ συγκροτεῖσαι ἀπὸ τοῦ φίλου A ἀπαλλάσσει τοῦ κλήρου μετὰ γήρωσ p 12 δεκάπρωτος ἑξαπίνης  
(ἑξαίφνης A) Ap **2833** 13 θεωρήσαι] ἰδεῖν βραδέως δέ p 14 ἐπιβάλλη ταχέως p ἐπιβάλλη βραδέως  
A 15–17 responsa 8–10 in A e dec. 72.8–10 deprompta sunt 15 ὀλίγον δέ p 16 ἀλλὰ ἀτυχίς] τί  
ἀκαιρεῖς; p om. **2833** 17 οὐκ ἀπαλλάσσει τῆς γυναικός ἀμερίμνα p [οὐ καταλλάσ]σει τῆ γυνεκός (sic) **2833**  
19 οὐ κληρονομείσ A **2833** + ἄγωνα p 20 + ἀγωνίζου p 21 σοι A + ἕως γήρωσ p

1 You will be sold as a slave 2 Buy the thing you have in mind 3 You will  
be able to sell 4 Your belongings will be sold at auction 5 You will profit from the  
undertaking 6 The traveller is alive and will return 7 You will not get the money  
just now 8 You will buy nothing just now 9 Your girl friend will remain with you  
10 Your first wife will not stay with you 11 You will not be separated from your girl  
friend 12 You will become a decemvir 13 You will be able to see your homeland  
14 You will finish what you intend 15 You will get a small bequest 16 You have  
not been poisoned, but you are unlucky 17 You will not be able to get free of your  
wife 18 You will not be safe from the allegation 19 You will inherit from your  
wife 20 Argue your case. You will win 21 Your property will not remain in your  
possession

1 Cf. 2a.4 (66.1).

11 Uninscribed space on the papyrus makes it appear that the line did not continue after ἀπαλλάσσει. Though

οὐκ ἀπαλλάσσει alone would constitute a sufficient answer to the question, it is more likely that the descender of the ρ in πρῶ[τη] in the previous line interrupted the flow of this answer, which would have started up again where there is now a lacuna.

16 See commentary on 1b.9 (32.10) above.

4a

→	ργ	οὐκ ἀποδημῖς νῦ[ν]	17
		προκόπτεις ἕξαπίνη[ς]	16
		οὐ κοινωνίς καλῶ[ς]	15
		οὐ στρατεύη ἄρτι	14
5		οὐκ ἔχεις ἐργασίαν	13
		οὐ πλεῦσις . . . η[ς]	12
		ὁ συνεχόμενος ἀ[πολύεται]	103
		οὐ καταλλάσσει [τῇ γυναικί]	102
		γίνη ἱερονίκης	101
10		καταλαμβάνη ἐ[πὶ μοιχείᾳ]	100
		~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	
	ρδ	ἀγοράζεις [	57
		ἀπαλλάσσει τῆ[ς συνοχῆς]	56
		οὐ λαμβάνεις ἦν [θέλεις γυναῖκα]	55
		ἀπαλλάσσει τῆς [ἀσθενείας]	54
15		οὐ σώζει τῆς συ[κοφαντίας]	53
		κληρονομίς τὴν γυναῖκα	52
		εἰπέ τὴν δίκην. νικᾷς	51
		μένι σου τὰ ὑπάρχοντα	50
		οὐ λαμβάνεις τῆν [φερνήν]	49
20		[κληρονομεῖς το]ῦς [γονεῖς]	48
		~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	
	ρε	ἐὰν θῆς παραβόλιον, ἀπολλεθε	69
		οὐκ ἔχεις ἐλπίδα πίστεως	68
		ἐπιτεύξει τῆς ἐπικλήσεως	67
		καταλλάσσει τῇ φίλῃ	66
25		στρατηγῆς σοὶ οὐ συμφέρι	65
		ἔχεις θ[άν]ατον σὸν <θεωρῆσαι>	64
		οὐ νικᾷς. σιώπα	63

1 l. ἀποδημῖς

2 l. προκόπτεις

3 l. κοινωνεῖς

5 l. ἔχεις

6 l. πλεῦσις



	[ϙς	]σπαρηναι	
5		[τὸν φ]ίλον	38?
		[οὐκ ἔχεις ἐσχάτ]ην καλήν	37
		[εὐρίσκεις τὸν φ]υγόντα	36
		[οὐ δύνασαι νῦ]ν ἄρξασθε	35
		[κληρονομεῖς τῆ]ν μητέρα	34
10		[οὐ κληρονομεῖ]ς τὸν πατέρα	33
		[ἐλευθεροῖ τῆ]ς πραγματίας	32
		[οὐχ ὑβρί]ζη. μὴ ἀγωνία	31
		[ζῆ] τὸ γεν[ι]νηθέν. τρέφε	30
		[οὐ κό]ζη] τῆς κατηγορίας	29
		~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	
15	[ϙζ	. . . ]ςης ἐκ κόπων	13
		[ὁ ἀπόδ]ημος ἀπέθανεν	80
		[ἐὰν πλε]ύσης, ναυαγίς	12
		[ἀπαρτί]ζει]ς ὁ ἐπιβάλλη	93
		[πρε]σβε[ύ]σης ἐπικινδύνως	87
20		[προ]γράφετέ τὰ κά	82
		ἀποκαθ[ί]στασαι εἰς τὸν τόπον	77
		[οὐ]κ οἶκ[ο]δομῆς νῦν	60
		ὁ συνεχόμενος ἀπολύεται	103
		οὐ καταλλάσσει τῆ γυνεκί	102
		~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	

8 I. ἄρξασθαι      17 I. ναυαγίς      19 I. πρεσβεύσεις      20 I. προγράφεται      22 I. οἰκοδομῆς  
23 I. ἀπολύεται      24 I. γυναικί

1 κληρονομεῖς οὐ μόνος p      responsum in A e dec. 96.8 depromptum est      2 ἐὰν μισθῶση βλάβη p  
3 οἰκονομῆς πιστευθεῖς (+ καὶ δοξάζη p) Ap      4-5 οὐ κληρονομεῖς τὸν φίλον Ap      6 + σεαυτῶ βοήθει p  
7 + εὐθὺς καὶ οὐ λυπῆ p      8 οὐκ ἔχεις ἄρξαι νῦν τί προσδοκᾷς; p ἄρξεις καὶ εὐημερήσεις A      9 + οὐ μόνος  
δε p      10 οὐ om. A      + μόνος p      11 ἐλευθεροῦσαι βραδέως (+ ἀλλὰ μὴ λυποῦ p) Ap      12 + ἀλλὰ  
θάρρει p      13 τρέφε] καὶ τρέφεται A οὐ ζήσει τὸ γεννώμενον ἀλλὰ τελευτᾷ p      14 οὐ om. A      + μετ' ὀλίγον  
p      15-22 responsa falsa in p ad quaestiones 19-12 quadrantia      15 ἐπιβαλέσθαι ὥρα (ἐστὶν) ἄπαξ μόνον  
A      16-17 in A ordo reversus est      17 ναυαγήσεις A (responsum 2)      19 πρεσβεύεις καὶ κινδυνεύεις  
A      20 + ἅπαντα A      22 οἰκονομῆς A      νῦν] οὐ δέδοται A      23 ἀπολύεται ὁ συνεχόμενος A + τῆς  
κυνοχῆς p      24 ἀπαλλάσσει τῆς φύλης μωροποιεῖ συμφέρει σοι p

1 You will not inherit now      2 Take a lease. You will not suffer a loss      3 . . .  
4-5 . . . your friend      6 You will not have a good end      7 You will find the fugitive  
8 You cannot be an official now      9 You will inherit from your mother      10 You will

not inherit from your father    11 You will be freed from the matter    12 You will not be harmed. Do not be distressed    13 The baby will live. Care for it    14 You will not be safe from the accusation    15 . . . as a result of your efforts    16 The traveller has died  
 17 If you sail, you will be shipwrecked    18 You will finish what you intend    19 You will become an ambassador to your peril    20 Your belongings will be sold at auction  
 21 You will be restored to your place    22 You will not build now    23 The one who is detained will be set free    24 You will not be reconciled with your wife

3-4 The remaining traces do not correspond to the readings of Ap.

8 This is the only extant response to question 35 (*εἰ ἄρξω ἐν τῷ πράγματι*) that employs a middle form of ἄρχω.

15 Fake answers in p and **2833** to question 13 indicate that the question was originally *εἰ ἐργάζομαι*; In Ap this was altered to *εἰ ἔστιν ἄρα τοῦ ἐπιβαλέσθαι* (+ τῷ χρησμῷ p); Restoration of this line is difficult because ]*τη* implies an active form.

Decade 97 in our papyrus, though much more similar to A in appearance, is almost certainly equivalent to p in function. In p, decade 97 is unshuffled decade 112, containing in slots 1-8 fake answers to questions 19-12 respectively and valid responses to questions 103 and 102 in slots 9 and 10 respectively. In A, the decade is unshuffled 14 with a valid response to question 13 in slot 1 and fake answers in slots 2-10. These fakes respond to a random sequence of questions except for those in slots 9 and 10, which, following the pattern in p, respond to questions 103 and 102 respectively. It is, however, precisely this anomalous sequence of fakes and the response to question 103 that lends credence to the notion that A is not a distinct edition, but is, rather, derived from an attempt to restore a missing table of correspondences: since question 103 is not found in the list of queries in A, answers to it would not be found in A, if A were not a derivative of p; and the fact that fake answers elsewhere in A are not sequential (i.e., they do not respond in sequence to a series of questions that are contiguous in the list of questions) suggests that 97.9-10 in A and, hence, A itself is based on p. The mechanics of this derivation and its effect on decade 97 were roughly as follows. In the original composition of the *Sortes*, the author made the operation of the text more complex and, hence, less transparent by shuffling the decades of answers, so the set of questions answered in any given decade no longer overlapped the set of questions answered in the previous or the following decade. Before this shuffling, the table of correspondences which we find in the *Sortes* between the list of questions and the decades of answers was not necessary because the oraclemonger needed to do nothing more than add the number between 1 and 10 chosen by the inquirer as his lot to the number of the inquirer's question to know in which decade the correct response was to be found; it would be the answer in the slot that corresponded to the lot number in the decade number that was the sum of the question number and the lot number. For example, before shuffling, the first response to question 46 would have been the first answer in decade 47 ( $46 + 1 = 47$ ). The second response to the question would have been the second answer in decade 48 ( $46 + 2 = 48$ ) and so on. After shuffling, a table of correspondences was needed to show that, for example, what had originally been decade 47 was now decade 33 and what had originally been decade 48 was now decade 5.

It has been argued that A was produced by someone whose copy of the *Sortes* lacked this vital table of correspondences. He attempted to restore the missing table by determining the unshuffled identity of each decade. He did this, logically enough, by looking at the first response in each decade, determining the number of the question to which it responded, and adding one to that number. The defect in his method, however, was his failure to realize that some decades begin with fake, i.e., unattainable answers. Such decades would not have been properly identified by this restorer's method. Perhaps the restorer saw in his text an answer to question 13 in the first slot of decade 97 and, not knowing this was a fake answer, added 1 to 13 to identify the decade as unshuffled decade 14 in his table. At some point subsequent to the creation of A, the fake answers in p were rewritten so they would follow the sequential pattern of the valid responses, leaving decade 97 in earlier witnesses of the text, such as this one, looking much more like decade 97 of the corrupt shorter version (A) than that of the more functionally

pristine longer version (p). For a more detailed explanation, see R. Stewart, 'The Textual Transmission of the *Sortes Astrampsychi*', *Illinois Classical Studies* 11 (1995) 135–47.

22 Question 60 in p is *εἰ οἰκονομήσω*; Though the question itself is not preserved in A, all of the answers to it in that manuscript respond to *εἰ οἰκονομήσω*; or similar. In the absence of other responses to question 60 in these fragments, one is unable to determine whether *οἰκοδομεῖς* is simply a scribal error in this instance or represents a form of the question and its responses that is unique to this witness.

5a

↓	οὐ̄πω κυμφέρι σοι συν[	a1
	οὐ̄πω προέκοψεν ὁ α[	a2
	~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	
ρις	πλεῦσον εἰς Ἀλεξάν[δρειαν]	b1
	ἔσῃ ἀρχιατρός, ἐὰν [	b2
5	οὐ̄ λαμβάν[ι]ς ἄρτι τὸ [	b3
	μετοίκησον τὴν π[	b4
	οὐ̄κ ἐπιτεύξῃ καλ[οῦ γάμου]	b5
	δώσεις ἀνεμποδίσ[τως	b6
	ὁ υἱὸς ῥήτωρ οὐ̄ δύνα[ται γενέσθαι]	b7
10	πορεύθητ[ι] ἐπὶ τὰ φ[	b8
	ναύλωσον εἰς Ἀλεξ[άνδρειαν	b9
	παράμεινον ἦν θέλ[εις	b10
	~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	
ριζ	οὐ̄ προτελευτᾶς τ[ῆς γυναικός	c10
	πλεῦσον. πρῆξῆσαι [	c11
15	προασφαλ[ί]ζου. [ο]ὐ̄κ ε[	c12
	οὐ̄ θορυβί[ς]αι. [. . .] . [	c13
	οὐ̄πω σου[.] οο[. . .] γκ[	
	μελ[. . .] ξ[	c14
	μέρος τ[. . .] ον[. . .] . [	
20	[. . . . .] . [	c15
	με[	c16
	[	
	δο. [	c17
	νη. [	c18

1 l. κυμφέρι

5 l. λαμβάνεις

8 l. δώσεις

12 l. παράμεινον

16 l. θορυβεῖσαι

1 It is not yet to your advantage . . .

2 The one who . . . has not yet advanced



3 Sail to Alexandria . . . 4 You will become a chief physician, if . . . 5 You will not get the . . . just now 6 Move to . . . 7 You will not obtain a good marriage  
 8 You will give . . . without hindrance 9 Your son will not be able to become a rhetor  
 10 Go to the . . . 11 Pay freight to Alexandria 12 Abide beside . . . which you desire  
 13 You will not die before your wife 14 Sail. To go by foot [is not to your advantage?]  
 15 Take safeguards in advance . . . 16 You will not be thrown into confusion . . . (or You will not be acclaimed . . .) 17–24 . . .

This leaf and those that follow contain an addition to the known text of *Sortes* that is paralleled in no other witness. The original sequence of these fragments is assured by the decade numbers visible on each piece with the exception of 8a–b, the proper position of which is uncertain.

2 Perhaps ὁ ἀπόδημος (cf. questions 15 (εἰ προκόπτω ἐν τιμῇ); 27 (εἰ ἔρχεται ὁ ἀπόδημος); and 80 (εἰ ζῆ ὁ ἀπόδημος;)). Questions about the welfare of a traveller are also found in the *Sortes Sangallenses*, e.g., 6.11 (*in absentium multum lacerat, de quo consulis*).

3 Cf. 6a.17 (172.5).

4 Cf. 6a.18 (172.6).

5 Cf. 6a.19 (172.7).

6 Cf. 6a.20 (172.8). Perhaps τῆν π[όλιν] or π[ατρίδα].

7 Cf. 6a.21 (172.9).

8 Cf. 6a.22 (172.10). The object may be something like τὸν λόγον. Questions regarding the advisability of taking a case to court abound in the *Sortes Astrampsychi*, e.g., 28 (εἰ δώσω τοὺς λόγους μου ἄρτι;), 51 (εἰ εἴπω τῆν δίκην;), and 63 (εἰ νικῶ τὸν ἀντίδικον;).

9 Cf. question 41 (εἰ σοφιστεύω; (altered in A to εἰ ὑπάγω εἰς τοὺς ἀγίους τόπους;)). The *Sortes Sangallenses* allow the petitioner to ask about his own chances of becoming an orator (e.g. 40.4—*stude, ut homo esse possis, non or[ator]* and 41.5—*si studeas, potes esse orator non mediocris sed bonus*) and to inquire generally about his son's chances of learning a skill (e.g. 44.2—*ad artificium non habet animus [sic] filius tuus, sed operam discat, quia prode erit [sic] ei et datum [sic] illi est* and 45.3—*poterit artem dis[ce]r[e] filius tuus*).

10 A series of responses in the *Sortes Sangallenses* (4.1, 5.2, 6.3, 7.4, 8.5, 9.6) with the basic construction *procede* (or *noli procedere*) *ad publicum* may provide parallels to this answer. If these are true parallels, τὰ φ[ανερά] is a possible supplement.

13 Cf. 5b.7 (118.5) and 6b.15 (175.10).

14 Cf. 5b.8 (118.6). Probably πεζεύσαι οὐ συμφέρει σοι or πεζεύσαι σοι οὐ συμφέρει.

15 Cf. 5b.9 (118.7).

16 Cf. 5b.10 (118.8). For θορυβί[ε]αι, cf. *Sortes Sangallenses* 21.7 (*non vinces; sine causa laboras; cautus esto, quia et turbaberis*) and 38.12 (*noli fugere neque te confundere*).

17–18 Cf. 5b.11 (118.9).

19–20 Cf. 5b.12 (118.10).

24 Unexplained stroke in ecthesis before νη. [.

5b

→ [ . . . . . ] . [ . . . ] . [ . . . . . ] . . . [ . ] . κρίττονάς c19  
 ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~  
 [ρη] συμφέρε]ι σοι δανίεσθαι ἐπὶ χειρογράφῳ c6  
 [εὐκαρπ]ήσῃ σου τὸ χωρίον ὡς οὐκ  
 ἐλπίζεις c7

5	[ἔχεις ἰδε]ῖν σου τὴν ἀδελφήν	c8
	[ἔφορ]ᾶς ἐκχθρούς σου βράδιον	c9
	[προτελε]υτᾶς τῆς γυνεκός σου	c10
	[πέζευσον.] πλεῦσαι σοι οὐ συμφέρι	c11
	[.....]. αἰ ἐκπλακῆναι	c12
10	[.....]. τοῦ φόβου. μὴ ἀγωνία	c13
	[.....]ην ἐν τῷ ὀφθικίῳ	c14
	κοπιᾶσας ἀπολήμψῃ τὰ κά	c15
	~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	
	[ριθ] ..... ]ς ἐκ τῆς φίλης σου	d1
	ς[υ]μφέρι σοι στρατεύεσθαι	d2
15	[.....] ἐπιτεύξῃ ἐπὶ γήρου	d3
	[.....] οσον μάτιν. οὐ συμφέρι	d4
	[.....]... τὸν ἀδελφόν σου ὅτε	
	[οὐκ ἐλπίζ]εις	d5
	[.....]... ρε τὴν ἐπις	
20	[.....]... αι	d6
	[.....] c. 21 κ]ατὰ γένεσιν'	d7
	[.....] c. 22 ]ς οὐδὲ κύ	d8
	[.....] c. 20 οὐ]κ ἐλπίζεις	d9
	[.....] c. 22 ]....	d10

1 l. κρείττονας      2 l. δανείσασθαι, χειρογράφω      3 l. εὐκαρπῆσει      4 l. ἐλπίζεις      5 ν of την  
 corr. from α      6 l. ἐχθρούς      7 l. γυναικός      8 l. συμφέρι      14 l. συμφέρι      15 l. γήρωσ  
 16 l. μάτην, συμφέρι      18 l. ἐλπίζεις      24 l. ἐλπίζεις

1 . . .      2 It is to your advantage to borrow on a note      3-4 Your field will yield a good crop beyond your expectation      5 You will be able to see your sister      6 You will have control over your enemies after a while      7 You will die before your wife      8 Go on foot. It is not to your advantage to sail      9 . . .      10 . . . from fear. Do not be distressed      11 . . . in the office      12 With effort you will regain your belongings      13 . . . from your girl friend      14 It is to your advantage to serve as a soldier      15 You . . . be successful in old age      16 . . . in vain. It is not to your advantage      17-18 . . . your brother when you do not expect it      19-20 . . .      21 . . .      22 . . .      23 . . . nor do you expect      24 . . .

2 Cf. 6b.11 (175.6).

3-4 Cf. 6b.12 (175.7). Similar responses occur in the *Sortes Sangallenses*, e.g., 2.9 (*hunc annu [sic] fructi miserimi*

*sunt; cave ne inopiam patiaris*), 3.10 (*hoc anno fructus bonus tibi significatur*), and 4.11 (*hunc annum fructi rari nascuntur et tempus laboriosum significat*).

5 Cf. 6b.13 (175.8).

6 Cf. 6b.14 (175.9). While there appears to be enough room in the lacuna for *οὐκ* before *ἐφορῶ*], *ἄς*, a positive answer is suggested by *βράδιον*. The sense of *ἐφορῶ* implied by the context is without adequate parallel. Both here and in 6b.14 the meaning appears to be ‘oversee’ in the sense of ‘have power or control over.’

7 Cf. 5a.13 (117.1) and 6b.15 (175.10).

8 Cf. 5a.14 (117.2).

9 Cf. 5a.15 (117.3).

10 Cf. 5a.16 (117.4).

11 Cf. 5a.17–18 (117.5).

12 Cf. 5a.19–20 (117.6).

14 Cf. 6a.23 (173.1).

15 Cf. 6a.24 (173.2). Perhaps [οὐχ ὄλωσ ἐ]πιτεύξῃ or [οὐ καλῶς ἐ]πιτεύξῃ.

16 Cf. 6a.25 (173.3).

17–18 The parallel answer in 6a.26 (173.4) suggests that the first word in the lacuna is *ἔχεις*. The most likely construction would then require an infinitive. *ἔχεις ἰδεῖν* (probably written *ἔχεις ἰδῆν*), following the model of 5b.5 (118.3) and 6b.13 (175.8) is the probable supplement.

19–20 Cf. 6a.27 (173.5). As the parallel answer implies, the primary verb of this response was probably a form of *πράσσω*.

21 Cf. 6a.28 (173.6). The parallel argues that the main verb in the lacuna was *ὑποπτεύεις*, but it is unclear what modifiers accompanied the word. Even *οὐ καλῶς ὑποπτεύεις* is too short to fill the lacuna adequately.

22 Cf. 6a.29 (173.7). Some form of *πάσχω* must have been the operative word lost in the lacuna.

6a

↓

[ . . . . ] . ἄδοσ[  
 [ . . . . ] παιδίον [  
 ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~  
 [ροα . . . .] υκοσι[ . . . ] [ .  
 [ . . . . ] θ . ους[ . . ] [ .  
 5 [ . . . . ] . λις . [ . ] δ[  
 [ . . . . ] . συν . [ . ] ψ[  
 [ . . . . ] ρο . κο . [ ] εν[  
 [ . . . . ] ζοι ταδ[ . . ] ζικ[  
 [ . . . . ] θελης . [ . ] . λ[ c. 7 ] . [ . ]  
 10 [ οὐ λή ] μψη χάριν . [ .  
 [ . . . . ] χι ερε[ . ] α[  
 [ οὐ κυμ ] φέρι κοι . [ . ] [ c. 9 ] . [ . ]  
 ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~  
 [ροβ . . . .] ωσονχ . ι[ . ] . κυμ] φέρι κοι  
 . [ . . . ] θερωσ . . . [ . . . ] λλακιδαν[  
 15 φ . [ . . ] ατεσου . . [ . . ] . ευθεωσ

	[οὐ κυ]μφέρι ςοι[. . .] . . τευσασθαι	
	πλ[εὺ]ς[αι] εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν κυμφ[έρει]	b1
	ἔσῃ ἀρχιατρ[ός, βρ]άδιον δέ	b2
	λήμψῃ τὸ [. . . .] .μα κοπιάσας	b3
20	οὐ κυμφ[έρ]ρ[ι σοι] κατοικῖν ἐν τῇ πατρίδι	b4
	ἐπιτεύξῃ κ[αλοῦ] γάμου, οὐ νῦν δέ	b5
	δώσῃς τὸν .[. . . μ]ετὰ κόπου πολλοῦ	b6
	~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	
	[ρ]ογ ο[ὐ] κ]υμφέρι ς[οι] στρατεύσασθαι	d2
	ἐπιτεύξῃ εἰς γ[ή]ρου[ς, μ]ετρίως δέ	d3
25	οὐ κυμφέρι . . . .[. . .][. . . ν] ]ο .ω .[. .]σι'	d4
	οὐκ ἔχῃς α . . . . τὸν [ἀ]δελφόν σου	d5
	πράξον τὴν κ .ςτην[ ]επι .[. .] .ην	d6
	καλῶς ὑποπτεύεις εκθ . . . .χ . . .	d7
	οὐ πάσχις κα . . . .νε . . να .νε .ε .[	d8
	~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	
30	ἀπελεύει εν .χειςς .[. .] .[ 4-5 ] .	d9?

12, 13, 16, 20, 23, 25 l. κυμφέρι      17 l. Ἀλεξάνδρειαν      20 l. κατοικεῖν      22 l. δώσεις  
 24 l. γήρως      26 l. ἔχεις      28 ὑποπτεύεις      29 l. πάσχεις      30 l. ἀπελεύει

1 . . .      2 . . . child . . .      3-9 . . .      10 You will not get thanks . . .      11 . . .  
 12 It is not to your advantage . . .      13-15 . . .      16 It is not to your advantage . . .  
 17 It is to your advantage to sail to Alexandria      18 You will become a chief physician,  
 but after a while      19 You will get the . . . by working hard      20 It is not to your advantage  
 to dwell in your fatherland      21 You will obtain a good marriage, but not now  
 22 You will give your . . . with great effort      23 It is not to your advantage to serve as  
 a soldier      24 You will be successful in old age, but moderately      25 It is not to your  
 advantage . . .      26 You will not be able to . . . your brother      27 . . .      28 You do  
 well to suspect . . .      29 You will not suffer . . .      30 You will go away . . .

13 A portion of the infralinear mark below the decade number is visible.

14 Perhaps παλλακίδα?

16 στρατεύσασθαι? Cf. 23. But the traces seem to require one letter too many.

17 Cf. 5a.3 (116.1).

18 Cf. 5a.4 (116.2).

19 Cf. 5a.5 (116.3).

20 Cf. 5a.6 (116.4). For possible parallels see *Sortes Sangallenses* 50.11 (*bene tibi est; ut quid patriam tuam desideras?*), 50.12. (*habes in fati patriam tuam videre*), and 51.12 (*et si reverteris, non constas in patr[ia]m tuam*).

21 Cf. 5a.7 (116.5).

- 22 Cf. 5a.8 (116.6).  
 23 Cf. 5b.14 (119.2).  
 24 *είς* must be a mistake for *ἐπί*. Cf. 5b.15 (119.3).  
 25 Cf. 5b.16 (119.4).  
 26 Cf. 5b.17–18 (119.5).  
 27 Cf. 5b.19–20 (119.6). For the form of final *ν* cf. 3b.7.  
 28 Cf. 5b.21 (119.7).  
 29 Cf. 5b.22 (119.8).  
 30 After the series of paragraphoi had been drawn, the original hand has added this extra response (= dg?) below them; the reading is complicated because the text is entangled with the paragraphoi.

6b

→	[ c. 14 ] . . . . . [	e1
	[ c. 14 ] . <i>ἢ ἀσφαλίζο[υ]</i>	e2
	<i>[ὄψη τούς σου. μὴ ἀγ]ωνία. ζῶειν</i>	e3
	<i>δαπανήσας ἀπολυθίση τῆς λειτουργίας</i>	e4
5	<i>μὴ ἀνακαθίσης ὁ θέλει πρόσωπον. μετανοεῖς'</i>	e5
	~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	
ροε	<i>ἔκδος τὸ παιδίον πρὸς ταμ . . . ἐν . . . ἰδη</i>	c1
	<i>ἦν θέλει τελε[ . . . . . ] . . . . .</i>	c2
	<i>παίδευον τὸ π[ . . . ] . λ. ἀπολαβ[ . . . . . ]</i>	c3
	<i>δέδοται σοι τα[ . . . . . ] ἰκακλι . . . . .</i>	c4
10	<i>ἔχεις καλῶ θ[ . . . . . ] τελευτησ[ . . . ] . [ . . . ]</i>	c5
	<i>μὴ δανείσης ἐπὶ χειρογράφω</i>	c6
	<i>εὐκαρπύσης σου τὸ χωρίον</i>	c7
	<i>ἔχεις ἰ[δεῖν] τὴν ἀδελφὴν σου. μὴ ολ[ . . . ] [ . . . ]</i>	c8
	<i>ἐφόψει ταχὺ τούς ἐκχθρούς σου</i>	c9
15	<i>οὐ προτελευτᾷς τῆς συμβίω σου</i>	c10
	~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	
ροσ	<i>οὐ καταδέδεκέν σε ἢ φίλη σο[υ]</i>	f1
	<i>ἀληθῶς ἐστὶν φάρμακος ἦν α[</i>	f2
	<i>γυνεκα</i>	

- 4 l. ἀπολυθίση, λειτουργίας      5 l. ἀνακαθίσης(?), θέλεις      7 l. θέλεις      10 l. ἔχεις  
 11 l. δανείσης, χειρογράφω      12 l. εὐκαρπύσει      13 l. ἔχεις      14 l. ἐπόψει, ἐχθρούς      15 l. συμβίου  
 18 l. γυναῖκα

1 . . .      2 . . . Take care      3 You will see your family. Do not be distressed.  
 They are alive      4 You will be freed from your liturgy after expenditure      5 Do not

abandon(?) the person you desire. You will be sorry      6 Give your child over to . . .  
 7 The (woman?) you desire . . .      8 Educate your . . .      9 It is granted to you . . .  
 10 You are able (*or* you have) . . .      11 Do not borrow money on a note      12 Your field  
 will yield a good crop      13 You will be able to see your sister. Do not . . .      14 You will  
 soon have control over your enemies      15 You will not die before your wife      16 Your  
 girl friend has not put a spell on you      17–18 It is indeed a poisoner whom . . . your wife

1 Above this line, the horizontal fibres have mostly been stripped from an area of c. 5 lines more. Occasional ink traces remain on the exposed vertical fibres.

2 Cf. 8b.5 (x.1).

3 Cf. 8b.6 (x.2).

4 Cf. 8b.7–8 (x.3).

5 Cf. 8b.9 (x.4). *Sortes Sangallenses* 12.11 (*noli dimittere persona* [sic] *de qua soniaris* = ‘do not abandon the person about whom you are concerned’ [for the meaning of *sonior* see Winnefeld, p.12]) may elucidate the meaning of the troublesome  $\mu\eta$  *ἀνακαθίεντι* (*ἀνακαθίεντις* in 8b.9). If our response is parallel to this answer, *ἀνακαθίεντις* is probably the second person singular aorist active subjunctive of *ἀνακαθίηνμι* (i.e. *ἀνακαθήσκητις*), which, although not attested in LSJ or Lampe’s *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, would reflect the penchant of late Greek for compounding verb prefixes. Its meaning would be ‘send down’, ‘let down’, hence ‘dismiss’. The response would then mean ‘do not dismiss (*or* desert) the person you desire. You will be sorry.’

10 Or *καλω* for *καλοῦ*, cf. 15?

11 Cf. 5b.2 (118.1).

12 Cf. 5b.3–4 (118.2).

13 Cf. 5b.5 (118.3).

14 Cf. 5b.6 (118.4).

15 Cf. 5a.13 (117.1) and 5b.7 (118.5).

17–18 The terrifying possibility of being poisoned without being aware of the act motivates question 91 in the *Sortes Astrampsychi* (see commentary on 1b.9 [32.10] above). If, as seems likely, this response expresses a fear that one is being poisoned by one’s wife, *Sortes Sangallenses* 48.10 is a parallel: *succurre tibi, quia a muliere medicamentatus es*. Here the fear may be that one is married to a poisoner or sorcerer. The sense of the response may be “It is indeed a poisoner [sorcerer], whom you are taking (17  $\alpha[\gamma\epsilon\epsilon\epsilon]$ ?) as your wife.”

7a

↓

]ι  
 ]ω χωρίω  
 ~ ~  
 τ]ὸ χρῆμα  
 ?στρα]τεύσασθ(αι)  
 5 ].  
 ὀ]λίγον νοσοῦντα  
 ]. ἔρχεταιί σοι  
 ].  
 ]ωσ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ σου  
 10 ]υμβίω σου

] φίλη σου  
    ].ηλι  
    ]κακός ἐστι.[.]...υ  
    ].γην τὰ τέκνα  
 15 [μῆ] λυποῦ  
       ]ις τῶν σῶν  
       ]

4 ]τενσαθς      10 1. κυμβίου?

2 ... the place      3 ... the matter      4 ... to serve(?)      5 ...      6 ...  
 being slightly ill      7-8 ... comes to you ...      9 ... in your home      10 ... your  
 spouse      11-12 ... your girl friend ...      13 ...      14-15 ... the children. Do  
 not be grieved      16-17 ...

3-17 The length of the lines suggests that responses 1-10 of this decade began in lines 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14 and 16 respectively. Lines 5, 8, 12, 15 and 17 then contained the endings of responses begun in the previous lines.

17 There are no traces of expected paragraphoi in the deep space below 16, so that a short line concluding the response starting in 16 must have come here.

7b

→	ἔχικ διαβληθῆ[ναι	g1
	φθονηθῆς ὑπὸ [	
	σεα[	g2
	ὄψονταί σε . . [	g3
5	οὐ [.] . . λ. . . . [	g4
	ἔχουσαν χρόνον[ον	g5
	στρατεύονται[ι ?	g6
	~ ~ ~ ~ ~	
ση	ἔχουσαν [	h1
	οὐ σε . . [	h2
10	στρατεύ[ε]-	h3
	..... [	
	[                    ]	h4
	μὴ ἀμε[	h5
	προγυμν. . [	h6

15	δανικα . [	h7
	νοσει̂ς ε . . . [	h8
	συμφε̄[ρει σοι	h9
	[.] . . . [	h10
	. . . . .	

1 l. ἔχεις      2 ὑπο      4 l. σε?      16 l. νοσει̂ς

- 1 You are capable of being slandered . . .      2–3 You will be envied by . . .  
 4 (They) will see you(?) . . .      5 . . .      6 They have time . . .      7 They will serve  
 as soldiers (*or* Serve as a soldier) . . .      8 They have (*or* are able) . . .      9–14 . . .  
 15 Having lent(?) . . .      16 You are ill . . .      17 It is to your advantage . . .      18 . . .

7 Also possible is the articulation *στράτευσον τ.* [

11–12 Blank space below line 11 indicates that the answer occupied two lines.

14 Undoubtedly some form of *προγυμνάζω*, probably second person indicative or imperative.

8a

	. . . . .
↓	], π[
	], . λι.
	] . . εἰλακη
	] εδίου
5	] . μίας
	] κ[ρ]ίττονας
	] ταςθε
	~ ~
	ἀς] φαλίζου
	] ν̄ ἐνθυμῆ γάμω
10	συ] μφέρι σοι μαθῖν
	] . ἰν παιδευθέν
	] ν̄

6 l. κρείττονας      10 l. συμφέρει, μαθεῖν

7 Perhaps ]χαςθε; probably the ending of an aorist middle infinitive.



8b

→ [.....]... [  
 .αχ.....πι. [  
 .θ.ε[  
 θ.ε.λ.η. .... [  
 ~ ~ ~

5 ].. τηρήσει τήν [ e2  
 ὄψει τοὺς ζο[ὺς e3  
 ἀπολυθήσει τῆς λ[ειτουργίας] e4  
 διαπ[ανήσεας] e5  
 μὴ ἀνακαθήσει ὃ θέ[λει πρόσωπον] e6  
 10 κοπιάσας διαλλάσει. [ e6

9 l. ἀνακαθήσει(?)

1-4 . . . 5 You will take guard against the . . . 6 You will see your family . . .  
 7-8 You will be freed from your liturgy after expenditure 9 Do not abandon the  
 person you desire 10 After working diligently you will be reconciled . . .

The absence of a legible decade number on this piece prevents us from positioning it correctly, but, from the parallels in decade 174 to lines 5-9 above, it is certain that the fragment derives from the portion of the codex that was an addition to what has become the standard text of the *Sortes*.

5 Cf. 6b.2 (174.7).

6 Cf. 6b.3 (174.8).

7-8 Cf. 6b.4 (174.9).

9 Cf. 6b.5 (174.10).

R. STEWART

## IV. DOCUMENTARY TEXTS

### 4582. PETITION FROM BEEKEEPERS

34 4B.73/B(1-2)a

14.5 × 17.5 cm

14-27 September 16

Published by R. D. Sullivan, 'A petition of beekeepers at Oxyrhynchus', *BASP* 10 (1973) 5-13, with plate.

Two brothers, beekeepers, petition the strategus regarding damage to 87 out of 487 hives belonging to themselves and the sons of one of them. The end of the text is restored partly following the proposals of M. Z. Kopidakis, *MPhL* 2 (1977) 203-5. On beekeeping see also **4583**. The back is blank.

*Ἡροστράτῳ στρατηγῷ*  
*παρὰ Ἡρακ[λ]είου καὶ Ὀννώφριος ἀμφοτέρων Σαραπίωνο(ς)*  
*τῶν ἀπ' Ὀξυρύγχων πόλεως μελισουργῶν.*  
*ὑπάρχει ἡμεῖν καὶ τοῖς τοῦ Ἡρακλείου υἱο(ῖ)ς ζμήνη*  
 5 *μελίσση τετρακόσια ὄγδοήκοντα ἑπτὰ ἀφ' ὧν*  
*εἴχαμεν ἐν κώμῃ Τόκα τῆς μέσης τοπαρχίας*  
*ἐν τόπῳ λεγομένῳ Πέτνῃ ἐν τῇ Διογένους οἰκίᾳ*  
*ζμήνη ὄγδοήκοντα ἑπτὰ ἀκολουθῶς ἢ πεποήμε-*  
*θα τῷ διε[λ]ηλυθότι β (ἔτει) Τιβερίου Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ ἀπογρα-*  
 10 *φῆι. τῇ [δὲ] ἰζ̄ τοῦ ἐρεστῶτος μηνὸς Σεβαστοῦ*  
*τοῦ γ (ἔτους) Τιβερίου Καίσαρ[ο]ς Σεβαστοῦ παραγενηθέντων*  
*ἡμῶν εἰς τὸν δηλούμενον τόπον πρὸς τὴν τῶν*  
*ζμηνῶν ἐπίσκεψιν, εὔρομεν μέρος τῶν ζμη-*  
*νῶν διεφθαρμένον, τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ ζμήνη ἀπὸ*  
 15 *ἀσθενείας ὄντα (ᾧστε) κινδυνεύειν λειφθῆναι. καὶ πάρ-*  
*αυτὰ ἐπρωτήσαμεν τὸν τῆς οἰκίας κύριον*  
*Διογένην περὶ τούτων καὶ ἔφη μοι ὑπὸ Σαραπίωνο(ς)*  
*τοῦ Θεώρου γυμνασιάρχου μεθ' ὧν ἐπήγαγεν*  
*σὺν αὐτῷ[ι] διὰ νυκτὸς λαθραίως τὰ ὅλα ζμήνη*  
 20 *[ἔνδον πηλῶ π]εφράχθαι ἐφ' ἰκανὰς ἡμέρας*  
*[καὶ μηδεμίαν εἴ]χειν τὰ ζμήνη διέξοδον τοῦ νε-*  
*[ c. 10 ] . . καὶ συμβέβηκεν μέρη του*  
*[ c. 10 ] . [ c. 3 ] . [ c. 4 ] . [ c. 3 ] . . . [ . ] . . . εν*

1 l. *στρατηγῶν* 2, 17 *σαραπιων*<sup>o</sup> 3, 5 Filler stroke at end of line 4 l. *ἡμῶν* Dot at line  
 end 1. *αμήνη* 5 l. *μελίτσεια* 6 l. *εἴχομεν* 8 l. *αμήνη* ε at end rewritten to give *πεπονημεε*  
 8-9 l. *πεπονήμεθα* 9, 11 L 10 Foot of *ν* at end of line extended as filler stroke 13, 14 l. *αμηνῶν*  
 14, 19, 21 l. *αμήνη*

‘To Herostratus, strategus, from Heraclius and Onnophris, both sons of Sarapion, from the city of the Oxyrhynchi, beekeepers. There belong to us and to the sons of Heraclius four hundred and eighty-seven beehives, of which we had eighty-seven hives in the village of Toka in the middle toparchy, in the place called Petne on the property of Diogenes, in accordance with the registration which we made in the past 2nd year of Tiberius Caesar Augustus. But on the 17th of the present month Sebastus of the 3rd year of Tiberius Caesar Augustus, when we arrived at the above mentioned place for the inspection of the hives, we found part of the hives ruined and the rest of the hives in danger of being abandoned because of their weakened condition. Immediately we questioned Diogenes the owner of the property about these things and he told me that it was by Sarapion agent(?) of Theon, gymnasiarch, along with those he had brought with him by night secretly, that all the hives had been blocked up inside with clay for several days and that the hives had no way out for the . . . , and it resulted that parts of the . . .’

1 For Herostratus see now G. Bastianini and J. Whitehorne, *Strategi and Royal Scribes* 86. **4582** remains the only attestation for him. Cf. 10 n. below regarding the date.

4 *ζμήνη* (l. *αμήνη*). For *ζμ-* in place of *αμ-*, employed consistently in this papyrus, see Gignac, *Grammar* i. 120-2, where (p. 122) no examples of *ζμήνος* were cited. Cf. also XLVIII **3410** 10-11 with note (citing the ed. pr. of the present text).

6 For *εἴχομεν* see Gignac, *Grammar* ii. 332.

For Toka see now P. Pruneti, *I centri abitati dell' Ossirinchi* 205-6, where this papyrus is the earliest reference cited.

7 For Petne see Pruneti, *op. cit.* 149-50, where again this papyrus is the first reference cited. This must always have been a small place, and was called an *ἐποίκιον* even in the third century and a *χωρίον* in the fifth, but other evidence (I **72**) already has it as a village in its own right by the end of the first century.

10 The 17th of Sebastus (= Thoth), 3 Tiberius = 14 September, AD 16. The text will date between then and 27 September since the month is still current. Only this unknown day is strictly valid, of course, as a date for the tenure of the strategus Herostratus (1), as Bastianini and Whitehorne *loc. cit.* make clear (cf. their conventions, p. 9).

17-18 Sarapion son of Theon is listed from this text as no. 7 in the list of gymnasiarchs by P. J. Sijpesteijn, *Nouvelle liste des gymnasiarques* (1986) 2. For the strategus and gymnasiarch Sarapion (*ibid.* no. 6), locality unknown, referred to in the ed. pr. from P. Mert. II 62, see also Bastianini and Whitehorne, *op. cit.* 112. The Merton papyrus remains the only reference for that Sarapion, but the text is to be re-dated to 22 March AD 7, since Dr Rea has corrected the reading of the month name in line 14 from *Φαῶπ(ι)* to *φάμ<sup>ε</sup>* = *Φαμ(ε)νώθ*). The article before *Θέωνος* is unexpected, and we are inclined to suppose that Theon, not Sarapion, was the gymnasiarch and that Sarapion was Theon's agent. Cf. J. A. Straus, *ANRW* ii. 10.1 851.

21-2 *νέ[μεθαι]* Kopidakis *op. cit.*

22 At end, *τοῦ?* Or *τοῦ<sup>-23</sup>των?*

R. D. SULLIVAN  
 R. A. COLES

## 4583. OATH OF BEEKEEPERS

1 I.B.115/G (g)

(i) 12.5 × 9.5 cm

15 September 45

(ii) 11.5 × 10 cm

Plate IV

Two fragments from the top and foot of an oath of beekeepers. The size of the gap between the two fragments is unknown. The text opens with the names of several of the numerous beekeepers, without any official address and with a substantial (4 cm) margin above. For beekeepers as a profession see further 4 n.

The papyrus is of interest for its information about the Oxyrhynchite strategus and royal scribe, see 5 and n.

Many of the uncertainties of reading are due to the awkward script rather than to physical damage. The date follows the main text in 10–11, in the same hand. The five lines of subscriptions that follow in 12–16 are in a succession of crude capitals, that in 15 rather more fluent than the others. The docket in 17 and the repeated date formula (to the same day) in 18–19 are in a very small cursive hand. The day of the month in 19 is written on a line all to itself under the end of 18.

There is a manufacturer's (three layer) kollesis a centimetre or so from the right-hand edge. The back is blank except for some possible offsets on the lower piece.

## Fr. 1

*Ἡράκλειος Πετεύριος καὶ οἱ τούτου ἀδελφοὶ Τοτοῆς  
καὶ Πετεύρις καὶ Ὀρχῆς Ὠρον καὶ Ἀκύχης Πετεύριο(ς)  
καὶ Σαραπίων Σαραπίωνος καὶ Πτολεμαῖος Α . . . ε . . . Ἰ  
καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ μελις[ο]υργοὶ τῶν ἀπ' Ὀξυρύγχων πόλ(εως)  
5 [ c. 3 ] . . . α Γαῖον Ἰο[υλίο]υ Ε[ . . . ]. στρατηγῶ καὶ Γαλατ[ί]ωνος  
[βασιλικῶ γραμματέως Ὀ]ξυρυγχέτου δ[μν]ύομεν Τιβέριον  
. . . . .*

## Fr. 2

*. . . . .  
[ c. 5 ] . ε . [ c. 7 ] . [ c. 15 ]  
[ἀπὸ τ]ῶν χρόνων Μαξίμου μέχρι τοῦ νῦν.  
[εὐορκ]οῦσι μὲν ἡμεῖν εὖ ἔη, ἐπιορκοῦσι δὲ  
10 [τὰ ἐ]γαντία. (ἔτους) 5 Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος  
[Σεβαστο]ῦ Γερμανικοῦ [Α]ὐτοκράτορος, μη(νός) Σεβαστοῦ τῆ.  
(m. 2) [Τοτο]ῆς Πετεύρις δμώμεκα τὸν ὄρκον.  
(m. 3) [Πετε]ῦρις Πετεύριος συνομώμεκ[α] τὸν ὄρκ(ον).  
(m. 4) [Ἡράκλειο]ς Πετε[ύ]ριος συνομώνεκα τὸν ὄρκ(ον).*

- 15 (m. 5) [Ἵρακῆς Ὡ]ρου κυνομάμεκα τὸν ὄρκον.  
 (m. 6) [Ἀσύχης] Πετεύρις κυνο[μῶ]μεκα.  
 (m. 7) [up to c. 10 letters] . κρ . . . ας . . . [space for up to 23 letters] (vac.)  
 [(ἔτους) 5 Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου Καί] [σαρος Σεβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ]  
 Ἀὐτοκράτορος, μη(νὸς) Σεβαστοῦ  
 (vac.) ἱη.

2 πετευρι<sup>ο</sup> (possibly πετευρι<sup>ος</sup>) 4 πο<sup>λ</sup> 9 l. ἡμῶν, εἴη 10 L 11 μ<sup>η</sup> 12 l. Πετεύριος  
 δμώμοκα First ο of ὄρκον corr. 13, 14, 15, 16 l. κυνομάμοκα 13–14 The ends of these lines are  
 obscured by offsets 13 ορ<sup>κ</sup> 14 ορ<sup>κ</sup>? 16 l. Πετεύριος 18 μη

(Fr. 1) ‘We, Heraclius son of Peteÿris and his brothers Totoës and Peteÿris, and Horses son of Horus and Hasychis son of Peteÿris and Sarapion son of Sarapion and Ptolemaeus son of . . . and the rest, beekeepers from the people of the city of the Oxyrhynchî, . . . of Gaius Julius . . . strategus and Galation royal scribe of the Oxyrhynchite, swear by Tiberius . . .’

(Fr. 2.8ff.) ‘. . . from the time of Maximus until now. If we observe the oath may it be well with us, but if we swear falsely, the reverse. The 6th year of Tiberius Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus Imperator, the 18th of the month Augustus.’

(2nd hand) ‘I, Totoës son of Peteÿris, swore the oath.’

(3rd hand) ‘I, Peteÿris son of Peteÿris, jointly swore the oath.’

(4th hand) ‘I, Heraclius son of Peteÿris, jointly swore the oath.’

(5th hand) ‘I, Horses son of Horus, jointly swore the oath.’

(6th hand) ‘I, Hasychis son of Peteÿris, jointly swore.’

(7th hand) ‘. . . .’

‘The 6th year of Tiberius Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus Imperator, the 18th of the month Augustus.’

4 οἱ λοιποὶ μελις[ο]υργοί. Beekeepers are attested as operating as a guild in **I 85** (re-ed. R. A. Coles, *ZPE* 39 (1980) 115–23) and possibly also in **LIV 3747**, both from the fourth century. See also R. D. Sullivan, *BASP* 10 (1973) 5–13 (referring to the present text on p. 8), republished above as **4582**, and P. Dubl. 11, with references; H. Chouliara-Raios, *L'abeille et le miel en Égypte* (Ioannina, 1989). Despite the beekeepers’ city origin, probably we need not assume that their hives were in the city.

5 The ink between the initial lacuna and the next one is all present; it is its interpretation which is difficult. *στρατηγοῦ* suggests that we need sense along the lines of ‘in accordance with the orders of’ *vel sim.*, but I have failed to read the Greek appropriately.

The identity of the strategus here is both uncertain and difficult; virtually every letter of the name could be differently read. ε in the cognomen is certain, but *E*[. . .], (genitive) is very awkward. I suppose *-λίου* *Θε[ωνο]ς* cannot be excluded, although enlarged ε with only slight ink before it does suggest an initial letter; but I hesitate to introduce what will seem a firm name on such thin evidence.

The sequence of Oxyrhynchite strategi in this period is confusing, although much less so since G. Bastianini and J. Whitehorne set out the evidence in *Strategi and Royal Scribes* (Pap. Flor. XV) 87–8. As laid out there, our man will come between Ti. Claudius *x* (**II 283**: Apollonius (*ZPE* 47 (1982) 259) easier than ed. pr.’s Pasion) and

-]νιος (X **1258**) and prevent their identification as proposed in the note on p. 87, as long as **1258** remains dated to 5 November 45. However, it may be admissible to re-date **1258** to the year before, reading [ἔτους πέμ]πτου in 12 (too long according to the editors, but ecthesis is possible at this point). The title in **283** is restored but must be likely, so that identifying our man with other C. Julii in this period is probably not possible (C. Julius Iollas, P. Oxy. Hels. 11; also in P. Oxy. Hels. 11.8–9, B. E. Klakowicz's proposal, *Stud. Pap.* 20 (1981) 60 (= BL VIII 273), to read C. Julius Phoebus is not justified by the original; seemingly also excluded is C. Julius x, P. Fouad I 27 with *ZPE* 11 (1973) 237 — note he has a short third name as does our man in **4583**).

At the end of the line, the evidence for the royal scribe is more clear-cut (Bastianini and Whitehorne op. cit. 140) even though no title survives in the present text. Γαλατ[ί]ωι in II **279** must be corrected to Γαλατ[ί]ωνι: the name is recorded in the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* ii (Attica). Galatius is now a ghost-name.

6 The initial lacuna has space for c. 13 letters; the title of the royal scribe will have been abbreviated in some way.

8 [ἀπὸ τ]ῶν χρόνων Μαξίμου μέχρι τοῦ νῦν. For this use of χρόνος cf. XXIV **2413** 4, 11 etc. By analogy with **2413**, Μαξίμου may be supposed to refer to the prefect Magius Maximus in office c. 14/15, see G. Bastianini, *ZPE* 17 (1975) 269; *ibid.* 38 (1980) 76, and *ANRW* ii. 10.1, p. 504. The complex chronology of the prefects in the reign of Tiberius is considered by J. R. Rea, *LV 3807* 39 n.; L. Cazzaniga, *An. Pap.* 4 (1992) 5–19. We may speculate on what it may have been that the beekeepers had (or had not) done for a period of thirty years.

16 The line appears to finish with -μεκα; uncertain traces beyond this are probably offsets.

R. A. COLES

#### 4584. DECLARATION OF A SLAVE FOR EPICRISIS

58/A(24)

8.5 × 18.1 cm

100/101

The text contains a declaration to the strategus from a woman relating to the examination (epicrisis) of a slave of which she owns two-thirds jointly with her brother/husband. She confirms that the slave has attained the age of thirteen and that her husband belongs to the class of metropolitites liable to the 12-drachma tax-rate. The declaration refers to a past 3rd year, which can be assigned to the reign of Trajan since the strategus is known. On the epicrisis in general see O. Montevicchi, *Proc. XIV Congress*, 227–32, and C. A. Nelson, *Status Declarations in Roman Egypt* (ASP XIX; 1979), with further bibliography. On the epicrisis of metropolitites see Nelson, Chap. 2; he lists examples from Oxyrhynchus on p. 11 and discusses them on pp. 16–19 (note that his P. Erl. 31 and P. Brux. inv. E 7910 are now SB VI 9161–2). For the epicrisis of slaves in particular see I. Biezuńska-Małowist, *L'esclavage dans l'Égypte gréco-romaine* 77. Other declarations concerning the epicrisis of slaves from Oxyrhynchus are IV **714**, PSI VII 732, XII 1230, and W. *Chr.* 217.

The papyrus was folded in three; it is warped and damaged down the fold-lines. It breaks off at the start of the oath by the Emperor, most of which is lost together with the date and the subscription. There is a manufacturer's three-layer kollesis at the right edge. The back is blank.

(m. 2) Δρόμ(ου) Θ[ο]ήριδ(ος)  
 (m. 1) Δίωι κτρ(ατηγῶ) Ὀξ(υρρυχίτου)  
 παρὰ . . [ . . ] . κτ . . τησ[ c. 8 ]

Διονυσί[ο]υ μητρὸς Ζωί[δος ἀπ' Ὀξυ-]  
 5 ρύγχ[ων π]όλεως μετὰ [κυρίου . . . ]  
 τος[. . .]ατους τοῦ[. . . . . ἀπὸ τῆς]  
 αὐτῆς π[ό]λεως. κατὰ τὰ [κελευσθέντα]  
 περὶ ἐ[πι]κρίσεως τῶν [προσβαιόντων]  
 εἰς (τρεισκαίδεκαετείς) [εἶ] ἐξί μῆτροπ[ολίται (δωδεκάδραχμοι) δηλώ]  
 10 Πετεύριν δοῦλόν μου κ[α]ί [ c. 3 ].[.].[. . . ]  
 μου ἀδελφοῦ Θώνιος κα[τὰ τὸ] μέρο[ς]υς  
 δίμοιρον καὶ τῶν ἀδελφ[ιδῶν μου] Δη[μη]-  
 τρίου καὶ Πετεύριος καὶ Ζωίδος κατ[ὰ] τὸ λ[ο]ίπ[ο]ν  
 τρίτον [ο]ἰκογενῆν ἐκ δοῦλης Θαίς[ιος]  
 15 ἀπογραφόμενον ἐπ' ἀμφοδου Δρόμου  
 Θοήριδος προσβεβηκέναι εἰς τοὺς (τρεισκαίδεκαετείς)  
 τῷ διελθόντ(ι) γ (ἔτει), καὶ τὸν ὁμοπάτρι[ο]ν  
 μου ἀδελφὸν καὶ ἄνδρα Θῶνιν ἱερο-  
 κόπον Θοήριδος καὶ Ἴσιδος καὶ Σαρά[πι]δος  
 20 καὶ τῶν συννάων θεῶν <εἶναι> (δωδεκάδραχμον) ἀπογρα-  
 φόμενον ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀ[μ]φ[ό]δου, καὶ  
 ὀμνύω Αὐτο[κρά]τορα Καίσαρ[α]

1 δρο<sup>4</sup>θ[ο]ηριδς

2 τρβοξ̄

9, 16 ιγL

17 διελθον<sup>7</sup>γ L

20 ιβς

(2nd hand) 'Quarter of the Avenue of Thoeiris.'

(1st hand) 'To Dius, strategus of the Oxyrhynchite, from . . . daughter(?) of Dionysius, mother Zois, from the city of the Oxyrhynchi, with as guardian . . . son of . . . -ates, grandson of . . . , from the same city.'

'According to what was ordered concerning the examination of boys who are entering the class of 13-year-olds, as to whether they are of the metropolitan 12-drachma class, I declare that Peteyris, the slave owned by me and by my brother of the same father(?), Thonis, in respect of the two-thirds part, and by my nephews and niece, Demetrius, Peteyris and Zois, in respect of the remaining third, born in the household to the slave Thaesis, registered in the Avenue of Thoeiris quarter, has entered the class of 13-year-olds in the past 3rd year, and (I declare that) my brother of the same father and husband, Thonis, diviner of Thoeiris and Isis and Sarapis and the gods who share their temple, [is] of the 12-drachma class, registered in the same quarter, and I swear by Emperor Caesar . . .'

1 For a similar docket at the head of a declaration concerning epicrisis see e.g. XLVI 3276-7.

2 For the strategus Dius see G. Bastianini, J. Whitehorne, *Strategi and Royal Scribes* 90; the texts which are referred to there by inventory numbers are now LVII **3905** and **3910**. Other declarations of this type from Oxyrhynchus addressed to the strategus are listed by Nelson, *op. cit.* 16.

3–4 X τῆς καὶ Y, daughter of Dionysius? or is Dionysius her grandfather?

4 Ζωί[δος. Cf. line 13.

7ff. PSI 732 is the only declaration to follow almost exactly the pattern used here; the other declarations concerning slaves listed in the introduction replace δηλώ with ἐτάγη and so have the slave's name in the nominative; cf. Nelson, *op. cit.* 17–18.

10 Πετῆρην. See Demot. NB. I. 5, 322–3, β3–βγ–βη.

One expects καὶ τοῦ ὀμοπατρίου, cf. 17, but the traces and the spacing seem incompatible with this wording.

11–12 κο[ινὸν ἐκ] μέρους διμοίρου could possibly be read.

12 τῶν ἀδελφ[ιδῶν μου]. ἀδελφ[ῶν is improbable. As one brother has already been mentioned, one would expect ἀδελφῶν to have been qualified by an adjective such as ἐτέρων, for which there is no room; and τῶν ἀδελφ[ιδῶν μου] makes the situation much easier to explain. The declarant's father owned the slave in question, who was inherited jointly on the father's death by the declarant, her brother Thonis and a third brother or sister; this brother or sister had subsequently died and the share had passed to his/her three children. The communal ownership of slaves is not uncommon; an example which is almost as complicated as that in **4584** is found in IV **716**.

17ff. None of the parallels referred to the introduction follows the same pattern as **4584**, but this is because in all of them the declaration is made by a single, male owner of the slave. Thus in W. *Chr.* 217.18–19, for example, the declarant says δηλώ αὐτόν [the slave] εἶναι (δωδεκάδραχμον) κάμῃ ὁμοίως εἶναι (δωδεκάδραχμον) ἀναγραφόμε(νον) κτλ. Why in **4584** the declaration was made not by Thonis but by his sister–wife, we do not know.

18–19 ἱεροσκόπων. This priestly office occurs in a number of inscriptions, being particularly common at Ephesus: see *Inscr. Ephesos* VIII.1, p. 38. It should mean a diviner who inspected animal entrails, a method of divination common in Greece, Rome and throughout parts of the Near East, but not certainly attested hitherto in the papyri (in O. Stras. 652.11 ἱεροσκοπ[ occurs, but as this is in the middle of a list of objects, it is very unlikely to refer to an office). Diodorus describes the Pharaoh's priests performing sacrifices and examining the entrails of beasts at i. 70.9: μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα τοῦ βασιλέως ἱεροσκοπησαμένου μόσχῳ καὶ καλλιέρσαντος κτλ., and at i. 73.4 he mentions the prowess of the Egyptian priests at divining, and gives the correct information that the priestly caste was hereditary in Egypt and subject to lower rates of tax. The practice may be referred to in P. Ant. II 65 ii, a magical text assigned to the fifth century. It may be relevant that P. Rein. II 93 and 94 record a ἱεροτέκτων of this same temple.

19–20 On this temple see G. Ronchi, *Lexicon Theonymon*, III 493–7, s.v. Θεῶρις, and L. Koenen, *ZPE* 1 (1967) 123–4. To Ronchi's references add P. L. Bat. XXV 43.10 and P. Mich. XVIII 788.2–3 (with note).

D. MONTSERRAT

#### 4585. DECLARATION FOR EPICRISIS

9 1B.173/C(b)

7.2 × 32 cm

January–February 189

The papyrus is virtually complete and the areas of damage do not seriously affect the reading. The autograph subscription of the presenter shows that this is an original document not a copy. There is a blank space of 13 cm at the foot and the back is also blank. The papyrus is of a coarse quality with a heavy kollesis down the centre.

The text preserves a declaration for epicrisis for entry into the metropolitan class on



behalf of Harpocration also called Ischyron. On such declarations see Nelson, cited in the introduction to **4584**.

Declarations are usually made by the fathers or by the owners in the case of slaves. Exceptions from Oxyrhynchus are III **478** = W. *Chr.* 218 and VII **1028** (by mothers), and XII **1452** i (by the uncle); in all three texts the fathers are dead, as is the case in the present text. In **4585** the person making the declaration is a freedman (cf. **478**, in which the declaration comes from a freedwoman applying to register her son); he makes the declaration in virtue of being a *φίλος* of the boy's father. We may compare VIII **1109**, where the declaration is made by the boy's father διὰ Διονυσίου Διδύμου φίλου, and XXXVIII **2855**, an application to register a boy in the gymnasial class made by a *φίλος* of the boy's deceased father. Possibly in **4585** the boy's mother was also dead and he had no close male relatives. Apart from this the declaration follows the normal pattern for the Oxyrhynchite nome at this period; particularly close parallels are **1109** and **1452** i.

παρὰ Θώνιος τοῦ καὶ Μώρου ἀπε{λ}-  
 λευθέρου Ἀρθώνιος ἀπ' Ὁξυρύγχων  
 πόλεως. κατὰ τὰ κελευσθέντα πε-  
 ρὶ ἐπικρίσεως τῶν προσβ(αιόντων) εἰς (τρεισκαίδεκαετείς) εἰ  
 5 ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων γονέων μη-  
 τροπολιτῶν (δωδεκαδράχμων) εἰσίν, ἐτάγη ἐπ' ἀμ-  
 φ[ό]δου Τεμγενοῦθεως ὁ τοῦ με-  
 τηλλαχότος φίλου μου Ἰσχυρί-  
 10 ωνος Cίβου τοῦ κ(αὶ) Δ[. . .] . . ζου <τοῦ?> Ἰσχυ-  
 ρίωνος τοῦ <καὶ?> Cίβου μητρ[ὸς . . .] . . καροῦ-  
 [τ]ος ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως υἱὸς Ἀρπο-  
 κρατίων ὁ κ(αὶ) Ἰσχυρίων μητρὸς [Cαρ]α-  
 πιάδος Cαραπίωνος προσβὰς εἰς (τρεισκαίδεκαετείς)  
 τῷ διελθόντι κη (ἔτει) ὅθεν παραγε-  
 15 νόμ[ε]νος πρὸς τὴν τούτου ἐπικρι-  
 σιν δηλῶ αὐτὸν εἶναι [(δωδεκάδραχμον) καὶ] τὸν  
 πα[τ]τέρα α[ὐ]τοῦ Ἰσχυρίωνα τετε-  
 λευτηκέναι . . . . .  
 ὄντα (δωδεκάδραχμον) διὰ λαογραφίας τοῦ  
 20 ι (ἔτους) θεοῦ Αἰλίου Ἀντωνίνου ἀμφό-  
 [δ]ου τ[οῦ αὐτο]ῦ καὶ τὸν τῆς μητρὸς  
 [τ]οῦ cη[μαι]νομένου πατέρα Cαρα-  
 πίωνα [Cα]ραπίων(ος) τετελε[υτη]-

κέν(αι) τὸ πρὶν ὄντα (δωδεκάδραχμον) διὰ λα[ο]-  
 25 γρ(αφίας) ἀμφόδ(ου) ἀναμφοδάρχων κ[αί]  
 ὀμνύω τὴν Αὐτοκράτορος Κομμύ[δου]  
 Ἄντωνίνου Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρ[ίου]  
 τύχην μὴ εἶ[ψεύθαι]. (ἔτους) κθ Αὐτοκ(ράτορος)  
 Καίσαρος Μάρκου Αὐρηλίου Κομμύ(δου)  
 30 Ἄντωνίνου Εὐς[εβοῦ]ς Ε[ὐτυχοῦς]  
 Σεβαστοῦ Ἀρμενικοῦ Μηδ[ικοῦ]  
 Παρθικοῦ Καρματικοῦ Γερμ[ανικοῦ]  
 Μεγίστου Βρεταν(ν)ικοῦ, Μεχεῖρ [.].  
 (m. 2) [Θ]ῶνις ὁ κ(αι) Μῶρος ἀπελ(εύθερος) Ἀρθῶ(νιος)  
 35 [ἐπ]ιδέδωκα καὶ ὀμῶ(μοκα)  
 τὸν ὄρκον.

4 προσ<sup>β</sup>ει<sup>α</sup>ς 6 ιβς 9, 12 κς 13 ιγς 14 κης 16 ιβς? 19 ιβς<sup>δ</sup>διαλογραφίας  
 20 ις 23 -πιω<sup>ρ</sup> 24 κε<sup>ρ</sup> ιβς 25 γραμφο<sup>δ</sup> 28 Λκθαιτο<sup>κ</sup>? 29 κο<sup>ε</sup>? 34 ς<sup>κ</sup>  
 απε<sup>λ</sup>αρθ<sup>ω</sup> 35 ομῶ

‘From Thonis alias Morus, freedman of Harthonis, from the city of the Oxyrhynchi. In accordance with the orders concerning the examination of those attaining 13 years, whether they are descended on both sides from metropolitans rated at 12 drachmas, there was registered in the Temgenuthis quarter the son of my deceased friend Ischyriion the son of Sibus alias D- and -sarus and grandson of Ischyriion alias Sibus(?) from the same city, Harpocraton alias Ischyriion, his mother being Sarapias daughter of Sarapion, as having attained the age of 13 years in the past 28th year. Wherefore, coming forward for his examination, I declare that he is rated at 12 drachmas and that his father Ischyriion died . . . being rated at 12 drachmas in the poll-tax list of the 10th year of the divine Aelius Antoninus in the same quarter, and that the father of the mother of the above mentioned, Sarapion son of Sarapion, died some time ago, being rated at 12 drachmas in the poll-tax list for the quarter of the anamphodarchi, and I swear by the fortune of Emperor Commodus Antoninus Caesar the lord that I have not lied. Year 29 of Emperor Caesar Marcus Aurelius Commodus Antoninus Pius Felix Augustus Armeniacus Medicus Parthicus Sarmaticus Germanicus Maximus Britannicus, Mecheir [.]’

(2nd hand) ‘I, Thonis alias Morus, freedman of Harthonis, have presented this and sworn the oath.’

1 According to Nelson, op. cit. 16–17, the absence of any addressee is normal in Oxyrhynchite declarations between 132 and the third century.

Thonis alias Morus has previously occurred in IV 725 63 of 183, where he writes for an illiterate; correct the reading there to Θῶνις ὁ κ(αι) Μῶρος ἀπελ(εύθερος) [ἀπε<sup>λ</sup> pap.] Ἀρθῶνιος. The hand is the same as the second hand here in lines 34–6.

9 *Κίβου*. Also in 10. The name is unattested, but XII **1446**, published in full by M. Hombert in *Mél. Bidez* (1934) 495–503, has in line 43 ]*ζωνος μη(τρὸς) Κιβούτος*; cf. also *Κιβί[ο]υ* in O. Douch II 153 B.5.

9–10 It is difficult to make genealogical sense of the names here without introducing two corrections, however reluctant we may be in principle to do this. Another solution, perhaps even more extreme, would be to delete *Ἰαχυρίωνος* in 9–10.

18 After *τετελευτηκέναι* there are faint traces of c. 14 letters, which presumably contained the date of the father's death.

23–4 *τετελε[υτη]κέν(αι) τὸ πρὶν ὄντα (δωδεκάδραχμον)*: cf., e.g., XII **1452** 21, 26, 55.

D. MONTSERRAT

### 4586. CESSION OF VACANT LOT

27 3B.42/E(1–2)a

12.2 × 31.8 cm

Third century

Philoxena daughter of Heron cedes to Taonnophris daughter of Petemennophris a third portion of a *ψιλὸς τόπος*. Neither party to the contract has appeared elsewhere. The property is located in Nesmimis (9), a village in the Upper Toparchy (P. Pruneti, *I centri abitati dell' Ossirinchi* 118). For *ψιλοὶ τόποι*, with lists of documents, see R. Rossi, *Aeg.* 30 (1950) 42 ff.; G. Husson, *OIKIA* 293–9; H.-J. Drexhage, *Preise, Mieten / Pachten, Kosten u. Löhne* 138–40. Note also J. Rowlandson, *Landowners and Tenants* 219.

The text was left incomplete; it lacks the address to the archidicastes, one of the boundary descriptions (12), the *κυρία*-clause and the date. Despite its imperfect condition, it was equipped with the subscriptions of both parties. Similar unfinished contracts are XXXIV **2723** (incomplete below) and P. Mich. V 263, 274, 305 (for the Michigan texts see the editors' remarks in the introd., pp. 7–8).

The back is blank.

→ *παρὰ Τ[αοννώ]φριος Πεεμενωφρι[ο]ς μητρὸς Ἐξερ-  
 κότιτος μ[ετὰ κυρίου Πα]μούνιος Παμούνι[ος] μητρὸς . .  
 μ . . . . . [ἀπὸ κώμης] Νεεμείμεως ἱερέως Ἀμμωνος  
 καὶ τῶν συννάων θεῶν μεγίστων καὶ παρὰ Φιλόξε-  
 5 νης Ἡρω[νος] μητρὸς Θε . . . . . μετὰ κυρ[ί]ου τοῦ ἀνδρὸς Ἀ[μ-]  
 μωνίου [Ἀμμ]ωνίου μητρὸς Α . . . . . ος ἀπὸ τῆ[ς]  
 αὐτῆς κ[ώμης.] συνχωρεῖ ἢ Φιλόξενα παρακεχωρ[η-]  
 κέναι τῇ Ταοννώφρι τὸ ὑπάρχον αὐτῇ ἐν τῇ α[ὐτῇ]  
 Νεεμείμι ἐν τοῖς ἀπὸ νότου ἔπ' ἀπηλιώτην μέρεσι τῆ[ς]  
 10 αὐτῆς κώμης τρίτον μέρος ἀπὸ ψιλοῦ τόπου βείκου ἐ[νὸς]  
 ἡμίτου ὃ ἔστιν βείκου ἡμίτου ἐκ τοῦ ἀπὸ βορρᾶ μέ-  
 ρους, οὗ γείτονεσ νότου (vac.) , βορρᾶ δημο-  
 κία ρύμη, ἀπηλι[ώ]τ[ο]υ Θώνιος Παυεῖριος, λιβὸς Ταπι-*

15 *κοίτος. τὰς δὲ συνπεφωνημένας ὑπ[έ]ρ τιμῆς καὶ  
 παραχωρητικοῦ τοῦ αὐτοῦ βείκ[ου ἢ]μ[ί]ζους ἀργυρίου  
 Σεβαστοῦ νομίματα δραχμὰς ἑκατὸν [αὐτ]όθι ἀπέσχευ  
 ἢ Φιλόξενα παρὰ τῆς Ταωνώφρ[ι]ο]ς διὰ χειρὸς ἐκ  
 πλήρους. καὶ [ἀπ]ὸ τοῦ νῦν τὴν Ταωνώφριν κρατεῖν  
 καὶ κυριεύειν [εὐ]ν ἐκγόνοις καὶ τοῖς πα[ρ]’ αὐ]τῆς μεταλημ-  
 20 ψομένοις εἰ[ς τὸ]ν ἅπαντα χρόνον καὶ χρ[ᾶ]σθ[αι] καὶ διοι-  
 κεῖν καὶ ἐπιτελεῖν περὶ αὐτοῦ καθ’ ὄν[τι]ν ἐὰν αἰρήται τρό-  
 πον, τὴν δ[ὲ] Φιλ]όξεναν μὴ ἐπιπορεύεσθαι ἐπὶ τοῦτο μη-  
 δ’ ἄλλον ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς μηδένα κατὰ μηδένα [τρό]πον, ἐπάναγα-  
 κον δὲ αὐτὴν βεβαιοῖν τῇ Ταωνώφρι καὶ τοῖς παρ’ αὐ-  
 25 τῆς μεταλημφομένοις καὶ παρέχεσθαι καθαρὸν ἀπὸ  
 ἀπογραφῆς ἀνδρῶν καὶ γεωργίας βασιλικῆς καὶ οὐσι[α-]  
 κῆς γῆς καὶ παντὸς εἴδους καὶ ἀπὸ παντὸς οὐτινοσοῦν  
 ἄλλου, τὸν δὲ ἐπελευσόμενον ἢ ἐνποισόμενον ἀφι-  
 στάνιν τὴν Φιλόξεναν τοῖς ἰδίοις δαπανήμασι καθά-  
 30 περ ἐκ δίκης.*

•

(m. 2) *Ταωνώφρις Πετεμενωφριως παρακε-  
 χώρημαι παρὰ τῆς Φιλοξένης τὸν προ-  
 κείμενον ψιλὸν τόπον καὶ ἀπ[έ]δοκα αὐτῇ  
 τὰς τοῦ παραχωρητικοῦ δ[ρ]αχμὰς ἑκα-  
 35 τὸν ὡς πρόκειται. Παμοῦνις [Π]αμοῦνιος  
 ἐπιγέγραμμαι αὐτῆς κύριος καὶ ἔγρα-  
 ψα ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς μὴ ἰδυίης γράμμα-  
 τα.*

•

(m. 3) *Φιλόξενα Ἴρωνος παρεχώρησα τῇ Τα-  
 40 ονωφρι τὸ προκείμενον τρίτον μέ-  
 ρος τοῦ ψιλοῦ τόπου, βίκου ἡμίτους,  
 καὶ ἀπέσχον παρ’ αὐτῆς τὰς τοῦ πα-  
 ραχωρητικοῦ δραχμὰς ἑκατὸν  
 καὶ βεβαιώσω ὡς πρόκειται. Ἀμ-  
 45 μῶνις Ἀμμω[νί]ο]υ ἐπιγέγραμ-*

μαι τῆς γυναικὸς κύριος καὶ ἔγρα-  
ψα ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς μὴ ἰδνεύης γράμμα-  
τα.

7 l. *συγχωρεῖ* 8, 24, 39-40 l. *Ταοννώφρει* 9 l. *Νεσμίμει* 10-11 l. *βίκου* 14 l. *συμπεφωνημένας*  
15 l. *βίκου* 24 l. *βεβαιοῦν* 28 l. *ἐμποιηόμενον* 28-9 l. *ἀφιστάνειν* 31 l. *Πετεμενώφριος*  
32-3 l. *τὸν προκείμενον* 33 l. *ἀπέδωκα* 35 l. *πρόκειται* 37 *v* of *ἰδνεύης* corr. from *o*; l. *εἰδνεύης*  
40 l. *προκείμενον* 44 l. *πρόκειται* 44-5 l. *Ἀμμώνιος* 47 *ἰδνεύης*; l. *εἰδνεύης*

‘From Taonnophris daughter of Petemennophris, her mother being Esersois, with her guardian Pamunis son of Pamunis, his mother being . . . , from the village of Nesmimis, priest of Ammon and the associated most great gods, and from Philoxena daughter of Heron, her mother being The- , with as guardian her husband Ammonius son of Ammonius, his mother being A- , from the same village. Philoxena acknowledges that she has ceded to Taonnophris the third share belonging to her in the said Nesmimis, in the southeastern sections of the same village, of a vacant lot one and a half *bikoi* in extent, which is a half *bikos* in extent in the northern section, of which the boundaries are: on the south (vac.) , on the north a public street, on the east property of Thonis son of Payseiris, and on the west property of Tapisois. And Philoxena has forthwith received from Taonnophris from hand to hand in full the one hundred drachmas in silver of the Imperial coinage agreed on for the price and cession money of the same half *bikos*. And from now on Taonnophris with her descendants and successors is to control and own it for all time, and she may use, manage and make arrangements regarding it in whatever way she chooses; and Philoxena is not to proceed against it, nor anyone else on her behalf, in any way, but she is bound to guarantee it to Taonnophris and her successors and to deliver it unaffected by census returns, cultivation of royal and usiac land, any impost or anything else whatever; and if anyone takes proceedings or lays a claim, Philoxena is to repel him at her own expense, as if as a result of a lawsuit.’

(2nd hand) ‘I, Taonnophris daughter of Petemennophris, have had ceded to me from Philoxena the aforesaid vacant lot, and I gave to her the one hundred drachmas for the cession money as aforesaid. I, Pamunis son of Pamunis, am registered as her guardian, and I wrote on her behalf as she is illiterate.’

(3rd hand) ‘I, Philoxena daughter of Heron, ceded to Taonnophris the aforesaid third share of the vacant lot, one half *bikos* in extent, and I received from her the one hundred drachmas for the cession money, and I will guarantee as aforesaid. I, Ammonius son of Ammonius, am registered as guardian of my wife, and I wrote on her behalf as she is illiterate.’

4-5 The temple of Ammon and associated gods at Nesmimis is attested in XLVI **3292**; see 9 n. there.

10 On the *bikos*, a square measure of unknown dimensions, see F. Luckhard, *Das Privathaus im ptol. u. röm. Ägypten* 22-3; R. Rossi, *Aeg.* 30 (1950) 55 n. 7; G. Husson, *OIKIA* 295 n. 5. That the term is not used exclusively with reference to *ψιλοὶ τόποι* is shown by XLIX **3461**.

13–14 *Ταπιείσιος*. Apparently unattested, though regularly formed, and other articulations are possible, e.g. τὰ Πισείσιος, ‘the property of Piseis’.

20 χρ[ᾶθ]αι: for this regular koine form see Maysen I<sup>2</sup> ii. 114.27.

24 For the frequent form βεβαιοῖν see Maysen I<sup>2</sup> ii. 116 n. 1; B. G. Mandilaras, *The Verb* 311–2 §746.

26 ἀπογραφῆς ἀνδρῶν. For the significance of this see LII **3691** 12 n.

29–30 καθάπερ ἐκ δίκης. Cf. XLVII **3351** 13 n.

31 Here and in 39 there is a heavy dot just above the first letter of the line; it marks where the party to the contract is to begin her subscription (cf. P. Mich. V p. 4; P. Petaus 32 introd.).

44–5 Ἀμμῶνις. For such common reduction of -ιος to -ις see D. G. Georgacas, *CP* 43 (1948) 243 ff.; Gignac, *Grammar* ii. 25.

G. M. BROWNE

#### 4587–90. TRANSFERS OF CREDIT IN GRAIN

The following group of texts documents the different types of transaction relating to private grain stocks held in the state granaries. The giro system was widely used, especially by metropolitan landholders with extensive but scattered landholdings, to pay tax obligations or private debts in one village out of stocks they kept in the state granaries in another village. There are four main types of text: (a) those that begin *μεμέτρηται*, ‘credited’, meaning physical deposits or ‘paying in’ of grain (**4587**); (b) those that (after the address) begin *διάστειλον* or *διαστειλάτε*, ‘transfer’, in the sense of giving instructions for a giro transfer out of the holder’s account to the credit of another account, government or personal (**4588**); (c) those that begin *διεστάλη*(η), ‘transferred’, attesting that such a transfer had been made (**4589**); and (d) those that begin *μεμέτρηται καὶ διεστάλη*(η), ‘credited and transferred’, implying that a quantity of grain had been physically deposited into the holder’s account but immediately transferred on the giro system to the credit of another account (**4590**).

Most of the documents emanate from the granary *sitologi*, except the early **4588** which is addressed to the toparch (for his involvement in the granary administration cf. BGU XVI 2560ff.) but shows that the system of private stocks held in the state granaries and giro transfers was fully operative early in the first century AD.

The range and complexity of the transactions is well illustrated by the Oxyrhynchite granary register PSI inv. 1778 recto, published by R. A. Coles in *Dai papiri della Società Italiana: Omaggio al XXI Congr. Int. di Papirologia* (1995) no. 12, pp. 62–76; note especially where a large physical deposit was then disbursed to meet various obligations, but leaving a surplus which was credited to the payer’s account (see p. 63, with XII **1444** 23). Cf. also P. Mich. XVIII 786, and see further P. Pruneti, *Analecta Papyrologica* 6 (1994) 53–91. A survey of these document types together with a full edition of the Oxyrhynchite *descripta* III **615–622** is in preparation by Dr Litinas, whose study is to include topics such as the usage of cases and verb forms, and the question of where the documents were issued and held and by whom (especially documents with multiple notices).

R. A. COLES

## 4587. NOTICE OF CREDIT IN GRAIN

44 5B.61/B(1-4)a

12.6 × 13.3 cm

179

A receipt from the sitologi for the payment of 50 artabas of wheat into the state granary at the village of Talao, for credit to the payer's account there, following the format standard in the Oxyrhynchite nome: for bibliography and discussion, besides the introduction to **4587-90** above, see XXXI **2588-91** introd. Another receipt since published is SB XII 11025 of 201. See also F. Preisigke, *Griowesen im griechischen Ägypten*, 110, 119. The sitologi of Talao are attested also by P. Köln III 137 (88) and probably by III **514** (190/191); perhaps also by II **385** descr. = P. Dubl. 5 (87/8). Other documents concerning payments in wheat from this village in the Roman period are P. Mich. inv. 69 in *ZPE* 28 (1978) 255-58 = SB XIV 12170 (31/32?); XII **1529**, XVII **2140** and XXII **2346** (all third century).

The first hand is a rather flat cursive, part ligatured, with no unusual features and characteristic of the period. The hand of the second scribe is less fluid and more angular, without ligatures.

The document is complete, though somewhat damaged along the fold lines, one running across and two downwards. The back is blank.

μεμέτρηται εἰς τὸ δημόσιον πυροῦ  
γενήματος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος ἐννεα-  
καιδεκάτου ἔτου(ς) Ἀὐρηλ[ί]ου Ἀντωνίνου  
καὶ Λουκίου Ἀὐρηλίου Κομμόδ[ο]υ Σεβαστῶν,  
5 διὰ (πιτολόγων) κάτω το(παρχίας) Ταλαῶ τό(πων), Γάϊος Ἰού-  
λιος Διογένης, πυροῦ ἀρτάβας πεν-  
τήκοντα, γεί(νονται) πυροῦ ἀρτάβας πεντή-  
κοντα. Φιλᾶδῆλφος (πιτολόγος) (ε)σημ(είωμαι) τὰς τοῦ  
πυροῦ ἀρτάβας(ς) πεντήκοντα, γί(νονται) (ἀρτάβαι) ν.  
(m. 2) Ὡρ[ος] (πιτολ)όγος (ε)σημ(είωμαι) [τ]ὰς τοῦ πυροῦ  
11 ἀ[ρτάβας] πεντήκοντα, γί(νονται) (ἀρτάβαι) ν.

1 εἰ 5 ct; so probably in 8 το<sup>2</sup> twice 5-6 ἰουλιος 7 γε( ): extended horizontal of γ bisects cursive raised ε1 combination 1 γίνονται, ἀρτάβαι 8 (ε)σημ 9, 11 tt 10 l. (ε)σημείωμαι

'Paid into the state granary, in wheat from the produce of the current nineteenth year of Aurelius Antoninus and Lucius Aurelius Commodus Augusti, through the sitologi of the lower toparchy, district of Talao, for credit to Gaius(?) Julius Diogenes, fifty artabas of wheat, total fifty artabas of wheat. I, Philadelphus, sitologus, have certified the fifty artabas of wheat, total 50 artabas.' (2nd hand) 'I, Horus, sitologus, have certified the fifty artabas of wheat, total 50 artabas.'

2 Since the deposit is from the produce of the current 19th year, the date can be restricted to the summer of 179.

3-4 This version of the imperial formula does not seem to be precisely paralleled. P. Hib. II 278 is parallel as far as it goes, but the text is fragmentary.

5-6 This C. Julius Diogenes has not appeared before in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. The use of the *tria nomina* does not necessarily indicate full Roman citizenship at this date: see I. Bieżuńska-Malowist, *Problèmes de la terre en Grèce ancienne*, ed. M. I. Finley, 254-5; LVIII 3924 4-5 n.

D. MONTSERRAT

### 4588. ORDERS FOR TRANSFER OF CREDIT IN GRAIN

29 4B.63/B(4-8)a

11.2 × 16 cm

26 September 33

Two orders for transfers of credit in grain, addressed to the same toparch Apion. The hand is the same throughout, and the date the same in each, but both payer and payee are different in the second order from those in the first. The toparch is new, and none of the other persons named in the document is certainly attested in B. W. Jones and J. E. G. Whitehorne, *Register of Oxyrhynchites*. The formula in 2-3, 12-13 is unusual.

The papyrus is broken off below 19. The text of the second order finishes at that point, but other similar orders may have followed.

Written across the fibres on the original recto: there is a kollesis parallel to the writing between 6-7. The back is blank.

Ἡρακλῆς Ὀρου Ἀμεινέω(ς) Ἀπίωνι τοπάρ-  
 χῃ χαίρειν. διάστειλον ἀφ' οὗ μεμέτρ-  
 ῆκα εἰς τὸ δημόσιον γενήματος ἐν(ε)α-  
 καιδεκάτου ἔτους Τιβερίου Καίσαρος  
 5 Σεβαστοῦ Ὀρω Ἡνιόχου πυροῦ ἀρτά-  
 β[[α]]ῆς μίαν χοίνικας δύο, (γίνονται) (πυροῦ ἀρτ.) α χ(οίνικες) β.  
 ἔτους κ Τιβερίου Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ,  
 μηνὸς Σεβ(αστοῦ) κθ̄.  
 Ἀμώις Ὀρου ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ μὴ  
 10 εἰδότης γράμματα.

Ὀρος Πτόλλιδος Ἀπίωνι τοπάρχῃ  
 χαίρειν. διάστειλον ἀφ' οὗ μεμέτρη-  
 κα εἰς τὸ δημόσιον γενήματος ἐν-  
 νεακαιδεκάτου ἔτους [Τιβερίου Καίσαρος]  
 15 Σεβαστοῦ Ὀρω Τοτοέους ἱερε(ῖ) πυ[ροῦ]  
 [ἀρτ]άβαι δύο, (γίνονται) (πυροῦ ἀρτ.) β.



[ἔτο]υς κ Τιβερίου Κ[α]ίσαρος ζ[εβαστοῦ],  
 μηνὸς ζεβ(αστοῦ) κθ̄. [Ἀμοίος Ὀρου]  
 [ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ] αὐτοῦ μ[ὴ] εἰδότος γράμματα.]

1 αμηνν<sup>εω</sup> 3 κ of ηκα corr. from α 5-6 ἀρτάβας corr. to ἀρτάβης; 1. ἀρτάβην 6 /ζ χ<sup>β</sup>  
 8 εεβ<sup>L</sup> 15 φ of Ὀρωφ corr. from ο 16 1. ἀρτάβας /ζ 18 ζεβ<sup>L</sup>

‘Heracles son of Horus, grandson of Amenneus, to Apion, toparch, greeting. Transfer, from what I deposited into the state granary from the produce of the nineteenth year of Tiberius Caesar Augustus, to Horus son of Heniochus, one artaba of wheat and two choenices, total art. wheat 1, choen. 2. Year 20 of Tiberius Caesar Augustus, the month Sebastus 29. I, Amois son of Horus, wrote on his behalf as he is illiterate.

‘Horus son of Ptolis to Apion, toparch, greeting. Transfer, from what I deposited into the state granary from the produce of the nineteenth year of Tiberius Caesar Augustus, to Horus son of Totoes, priest, two artabas of wheat, total art. wheat 2. Year 20 of Tiberius Caesar Augustus, the month Sebastus 29. I, Amois son of Horus, wrote on his behalf as he is illiterate.’

1 For the grandfather’s name without the article cf. LV **3804** 72.

G. AZZARELLO

#### 4589. NOTICES OF TRANSFER OF CREDIT IN GRAIN

26 3B.51/J(4-5) a

20 × 22.5 cm

168/9-174/5  
 Plate V

The papyrus contains two columns and preserves ten *διετάλ(η)*-type notices all to the credit of the account of Philotera, daughter of Stephanus and Aphrodite, at the state granary at Pela in the western toparchy, and was in use over a period of seven years. The transfers originated in (at least?) five different villages, and exhibit seven different hands. These hands are numbered in chronological order in the transcript, although the lines are numbered continuously down the columns as normal.

The *apparatus criticus* for the most part only presents the first occurrence of any form of abbreviation, for economy of space. In any case, given the typographical difficulty of accurate representation, the reader is referred to the plate.

Two major folds are clearly visible, a sharp vertical one between the two columns and a horizontal one halfway down the sheet: damage caused by this latter fold, already by 171/2 when the papyrus had been in use for three years, was presumably responsible for the deep gap separating the lower six notices from the four top ones.

The first column contains six receipts, the second column four, written below one

another. Their chronological arrangement in the papyrus is as follows (although nos. 9–10 pose a problem; dates in brackets are those where grain of the ‘past *n*th year’ is concerned):

notice no. 1 (lines 1–7) (167/8) 168/9 (1st hand)	notice no. 3 (lines 24–8) 168/9 Pela (1st hand)
notice no. 2 (lines 8–12) (167/8) 168/9 Senao (2nd hand)	notice no. 4 (lines 29–34) 169/70 Pakerke (3rd hand)
notice no. 7 (lines 13–17) (172/3) 173/4 Pela (6th hand)	notice no. 5 (lines 35–9) (170/1) 171/2 Enteiis (4th hand)
notice no. 8 (lines 18–21) (173/4) 174/5 Nemera (7th hand)	notice no. 6 (lines 40–47) (171/2) 172/3 Enteiis (5th hand)
notice no. 9 (line 22) s.d. Pela (6th hand)	
notice no. 10 (line 23) 172/3 Pela (6th hand)	

There is a clear manufacturer’s three-layer kollesis between the two columns. On the back there are scanty specks of ink, perhaps accidental (offset?), but the former presence of a docket or label cannot be excluded.

col. i

διεστάλ(η) (πυροῦ) γενήμ(ατος) τοῦ διελ(θόντος) η (ἔτους)  
 Αὔρηλιων Ἀντωνείνου  
 καὶ Οὐήρου τῶν κυρίων Σεβαστῶν  
 ἀπὸ τῶν προσκειμ(ένων) ὑ(πέρ) το(παρχίας), Φιλωτ(έρα)  
 5 Σεφάνου, ἀπὸ προχ(ρείας), Πέλ(α), συναριθ(μουμένην?)  
 ἀρτάβ(ην) μίαν ἡμικυ [τέ]ταρτ(ον) χοί(νικας)  
 τέσσαρ(ας), (γίν.) (ἀρτ.) α ς d χοί(νικες) δ.

(m. 2) διεστάλ(η) (πυροῦ) γενή(ματος) τοῦ διελ(θόντος) η (ἔτους)  
 Αὔρηλιων Ἀντωνείνου καὶ Οὐήρου  
 10 τῶν κυρίων Σεβαστῶν, ἀπὸ προχ(ρείας) . .  
 πρ(οσκειμ(ένων)?) ε(ιτολόγοις?) Σεναώ, Φιλωτέρα Σεφ-  
 άνου, {χ} χοί(ν.) δ, (γίνονται) {(ἀρτάβαι)} χοί(νικες) δ.

- (m. 6) διεστάλη (πυροῦ) γενήμ(ατος) τοῦ διελ(θόντος) ιγ (ἔτους) Ἀῦρηλίου  
 Ἄντωνείνου Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου  
 15 διὰ ciτολόγων λιβό(ς) το(παρχίας) Πέλ(α), ἀπὸ θέμ(ατος) Διογ( ) καὶ . . ( ),  
 Φιλωτέρα Cτεφάνου, Πέλ(α), (ἀρτ.) γ, (γίνονται) (ἀρτάβαι) γ.  
 Ἀπίω(ν) cεcη(μείωμαι).
- (m. 7) διεστάλη (πυροῦ) γε(νήματος) τοῦ διελ(θόντος) ιδ (ἔτους) Ἀῦρηλίου  
 Ἄντωνίνου δι(ὰ) ci(τολόγων) μέcη(ς) το(παρχίας) Νε(μέρων), ἀπὸ  
 20 θ(έματος) Ἡραϊδ(ος) Ἴcχ(υρίωνος),  
 Φιλωτέρα Cτεφάνου, Πέλα, ἀρτ(άβ.) τρεῖς, (γίνονται) (ἀρτάβαι) γ.  
 Ἐρμίας cεcη(μείωμαι).
- (m. 6) καὶ ἀπὸ προχ(ρείας) πρ(οcκειμένων?) ci(τολόγοις?) Πέλ(α), ἡ α(ὑπῆ),  
 Πέλ(α), (ἀρτ.) d χ(οίν.) θ.  
 ιγ (ἔτους) ὁμοί(ως) (ἀρτάβης) d χ(οίνικες) θ, (γίν.) (ἀρτάβης) ς d  
 χ(οίνικες) η. Ἀπίων cε(cημείωμαι).

## Col. ii

- (m. 1) διεστάλη (πυροῦ) γενή(ματος) θ (ἔτους) Μάρκου Ἀῦρηλίου  
 25 Ἄντωνίνου Cεβαστοῦ δι(ὰ) ciτολόγων Πέλα τό(πων),  
 ἀπὸ θ(έματος) Πετοσί(ριος) Πετοσί(ριος), Φιλωτέρα  
 Cτεφάνου καὶ Ἀφροδ(ίτη) μήτ(ηρ), Πέλα,  
 (ἀρτ.) α ς d χ(οίν.) β, (γίν.) (ἀρτ.) α ς d χ(οίνικες) β. Ζωῖλ(ος) βοη(θός)  
 cεcη(μείωμαι).
- (m. 3) διεστάλη (πυροῦ) γενήμ(ατος) δεκάτου ἔτους Ἀῦρηλίου  
 30 Ἄντωνίνου Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου  
 δι(ὰ) ci(τολόγων) ἀ(πηλιώτου) το(παρχίας) Πακερ[κῆ, ἀ]πὸ θέμ(ατος)  
 Διογ( ) μητ(ρός)  
 Θαήσιος, Φιλωτ[έρ]α Cτεφάνου καὶ  
 Ἀφροδ(ίτη) μήτ(ηρ), Πέλ(α), (ἀρτ.) μία ἡμικυ τέταρ[τον χ(οίν.) β,]  
 (γίν.) (ἀρτ.) α ς d χ(οίνικες) β. Χαιρ(ήμων?) cεcημ(είωμαι).
- 35 (m. 4) διεστάλη (πυροῦ) γενή(ματος) τ(οῦ) διελ(θόντος) ια (ἔτους) Ἀῦρηλίου  
 Ἄντωνίνο[ν Κα]ίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου δι(ὰ) ci(τολόγων)  
 ἄνω τρ(παρχίας) Ἐντεῖεως τό(πων), ἀπὸ θ(έματος) Διδ(ύμου?), Φιλωτέρα

Στεφ(άνου) καὶ [Α]φροδείτη μῆ(τηρ), Πέλ(α), <(ἀρτ.) α ς d χ(οίν.) β,  
<(γίν.) ἀπὸ θ(έματος) <(ἀρτ.) α ς d χ(οίνικες) β.

40 (m. 5) διεστά(η) (πυροῦ) γενή(ματος) τοῦ διελ(θόντος) ιβ (ἔτους)

Αὐρηλίου Ἀντωνίνου Καίσαρο[ς]

τοῦ κυρίου δι(ὰ) ci(τολόγων) ἄνω το(παρχίας) Ἐντείε-  
ως τό(πων), Φιλωτέρα Στεφάνου

καὶ Ἀφροδείτη μῆ(τηρ), Πέλα, ἀρτάβ(η)

45 μία ἡμις τέταρτον χοί(ν.) δύο,

(γίν.) (ἀρτ.) α ς d χ(οίνικες) β, ἀπὸ θέμ(ατος) Ἀμμω[νίου?]

Διογ(ένους?). Θέων ὁ κ(αὶ) Ἑρμίας βοη(θός) ςε[ςη(μείωμαι).]

(Col. i)	1	διεστα <sup>λ</sup> ζγενη <sup>μ</sup>	διε <sup>λ</sup>	ς	4	προκει <sup>μ</sup> υ <sup>ν</sup> το <sup>φ</sup> φιλω <sup>τ</sup>	5	προ <sup>χ</sup> πε <sup>λ</sup> κυναρι <sup>θ</sup>	6	αρτα <sup>β</sup>		
τεταρ <sup>τ</sup> χο <sup>ι</sup>	7	τεσσαρ <sup>ς</sup> /σασ <sup>δ</sup> χ <sup>δ</sup>	8	ζγεν <sup>η</sup> (with hook to left at foot of ζ)	L	11	πρ <sup>δ</sup> ? ct					
15	ciτο <sup>λ</sup> λιβ <sup>ο</sup>	θε <sup>μ</sup> διο <sup>ν</sup>	17	απι <sup>ω</sup> σε <sup>η</sup> ?	18	γε <sup>ν</sup> ?	19	δ με <sup>ε</sup> η	νε <sup>ν</sup>	θ <sup>η</sup> ρ <sup>αι</sup> δ <sup>ι</sup> ς <sup>χ</sup>	20	αρ <sup>τ</sup>
21	σε <sup>η</sup>	22	πρ <sup>δ</sup>	α <sup>ν</sup>	23	ομο <sup>ι</sup>	σε <sup>ν</sup>					
(Col. ii)	26	απο <sup>θ</sup>	πετοct	twice; unexplained diagonal above end of first one		27	αφρο <sup>δ</sup> μη <sup>τ</sup>					
28	ζωι <sup>λ</sup> βο <sup>η</sup> σε <sup>ν</sup>	29	δ	31	α <sup>τ</sup>	34	Form of χαιρ( ) not clear	σε <sup>η</sup> μ <sup>ι</sup>	35	τ <sup>ν</sup>	37	δι <sup>δ</sup>
38	στεφ <sup>?</sup>	μη <sup>ν</sup>	39	θ <sup>ν</sup>	46	θεμ <sup>ς</sup>	47	ο <sup>κ</sup>				

(Col. i)

(Lines 1–7) ‘Transferred, in wheat of the produce of the past 8th year of Aurelii Antoninus and Verus the lords Augusti, from the deposits accumulated for the toparchy(?), for credit to Philotera daughter of Stephanus, because of a loan in advance, at Pela, added up together(?), one artaba and three-quarters and four choenices, total art. 1 ½ ¼ ch. 4.’

(2nd hand; lines 8–12) ‘Transferred, in wheat of the produce of the past 8th year of Aurelii Antoninus and Verus the lords Augusti, because of a loan in advance from the accumulated deposits of the sitologi of Senao, for credit to Philotera daughter of Stephanus, 4 choenices, total {art.} ch. 4.’

(6th hand, lines 13–17) ‘Transferred, in wheat of the produce of the past 13th year of Aurelius Antoninus Caesar the lord, through the sitologi of the western toparchy, Pela, from the deposit of Diog( ) and (?) . . . , for credit to Philotera daughter of Stephanus, at Pela, 3 artabas, total art. 3. I, Apion, have signed.’

(7th hand, lines 18–21) ‘Transferred, in wheat of the produce of the past 14th year of Aurelius Antoninus, through the sitologi of the middle toparchy, Nemera, from the deposit of Heraïs daughter of Ischyron, for credit to Philotera daughter of Stephanus, at Pela, three artabas, total art. 3. I, Hermias, have signed.’

(6th hand, lines 22–3) ‘And because of a loan in advance from the accumulated deposits of the sitologi of Pela, for credit to the same, at Pela, ¼ of an artaba and 9 choenices.

‘For the 13th year likewise, ¼ of an artaba and 9 choenices. Total art. ¾ ch. 8. I, Apion, have signed.’

(Col. ii)

(1st hand, lines 24–8) ‘Transferred, in wheat of the produce of the 9th year of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Augustus, through the sitologi of the district of Pela, from the deposit of Petosiris son of Petosiris, for credit to Philotera daughter of Stephanus and to Aphrodite her mother, at Pela,  $1 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{4}$  artabas and 2 choenices, total art.  $1 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{4}$  ch. 2. I, Zoilus, assistant, have signed.’

(3rd hand, lines 29–34) ‘Transferred, in wheat of the produce of the tenth year of Aurelius Antoninus Caesar the lord, through the sitologi of the eastern toparchy, Pakerke, from the deposit of Diog(), mother Thaesis, for credit to Philotera daughter of Stephanus and to Aphrodite her mother, at Pela, one artaba and three-quarters and 2 choenices, total art.  $1 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{4}$  ch. 2. I, Chaeremon(?), have signed.’

(4th hand, lines 35–9) ‘Transferred, in wheat of the produce of the past 11th year of Aurelius Antoninus Caesar the lord, through the sitologi of the upper toparchy, district of Enteiiis, from the deposit of Did(ymus?), for credit to Philotera daughter of Stephanus and to Aphrodite her mother, at Pela,  $1 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{4}$  artabas and 2 choenices, (total) from the deposit (art.)  $1 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{4}$  ch.2.’

(5th hand, lines 40–47) ‘Transferred, in wheat of the produce of the past 12th year of Aurelius Antoninus Caesar the lord, through the sitologi of the upper toparchy, district of Enteiiis, for credit to Philotera daughter of Stephanus and to Aphrodite her mother, at Pela, one artaba and three-quarters and two choenices, total art.  $1 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{4}$  ch. 2, from the deposit of Ammo[nius?] son of Diog(enes?). I, Theon alias Hermias, assistant, have signed.’

<sup>4</sup> ἀπὸ τῶν προσκειμ(ένων): cf. 11, 22? The same usage only in SB XIV 12079.1–2 = H. C. Youtie, *ZPE* 23 (1976) 102 (= *Script. Post.* I 354) where it is translated ‘from the amounts specified’, hard to understand in our context. Perhaps cf. also XLIX 3496 6–7 and SB XII 11151.3–4. In any case, we have lost the expected mention of the sitologi at this point.

<sup>5</sup> ἀπὸ προχ(ρείας): cf. the same phrase below, 10 and 22. Note that transfers ἀπὸ προχ(ρείας) and transfers ἀπὸ θέματος with a personal name are mutually exclusive.

For the village of Pela, in the western toparchy, see P. Pruneti, *I centri abitati dell’ Ossirinchie* 142–5.

<sup>11</sup> For the village of Senao, in the western toparchy, see Pruneti, op. cit. 163–4.

<sup>19</sup> For the village of Nemera see Pruneti, op. cit. 114–5.

<sup>23</sup> (ἀρτ.) ∫ d χ(όινικες) η. The calculation shows that an artaba of 40 choenices was used. For a brief summary of the controversy regarding artaba : choenix sizes, see D. W. Rathbone, *ZPE* 53 (1983) 271–2 with references; also LV 3804 141–2 n.

<sup>31</sup> For the village of Pakerke see Pruneti, op. cit. 131–3.

<sup>33</sup> μία: so in 45; contrast 6.

<sup>37</sup> For the village of Enteiiis (which recurs in 42–3) see Pruneti, op. cit. 46–47.

<sup>47</sup> Theon alias Hermias is attested in XXXVIII 2871 8 (Seryphis, western toparchy, 175/6) and XII 1539 10, 18 (Petne, middle toparchy, and Isieion Ano, lower toparchy, 179/80). The hand in 2871 is the same as here. It has not been possible to check 1539. Theon was then assistant over a period of at least six years (this new attestation dating from 172/3), but we cannot say whether this period was continuous or not. Assessment of his post is further complicated by the variations in location.

N. LITINAS

## 4590. NOTICES OF TRANSFER OF CREDIT IN GRAIN

26 3B.51/J(10-12)a+b

42.5 × 17 cm

Summer 231

The papyrus preserves the tops of three columns of notices of grain transfers, of the *μεμέτρηται καὶ διεστάλ(η)* type (see the introd. to **4587–90** above) which represents direct physical deposits to the credit of a private account at a state granary, followed by immediate giro transfers of the deposited wheat to meet obligations elsewhere. There is no surplus from these transactions, for credit to the depositor's account; it is perhaps more likely that the giro transfers represented part payment, rather than that a precisely calculated quantity of grain was taken to the granary to meet a specific obligation. The three columns contain a total of six different transactions in perhaps four different hands, with each column relating to a different village.

The transactions concern the produce of the current tenth year of Severus Alexander (230/1) and must therefore be dated in the summer of 231. They would appear to indicate farming on a substantial scale, with 316 artabas paid in tax on one plot at Sko (20), and an area of 81 ½ aruras perhaps to be deduced from 22–3. The transactions are variously in the names of Aurelia Heraclia daughter of Diogenes (19 n.) and Aurelius Hieracapollon alias Epimachus, (former?) gymnasiarch (10–11 n.). The two certainly operated jointly, cf. the combined amounts in 24 ff., and might have been husband and wife: see further 4 n.

Columns i–ii are now framed separately from column iii, but the two pieces do belong together (and did not form a *τόμος συγκολλήσιμος*) as the separated manufacturer's three-layer kollesis between columns ii and iii makes clear. The reconstituted text has a straight top edge, but unequal upper margins (col. i 3.5 cm, cols. ii–iii 2.3 cm). Note the repeated damage pattern; the damage in col. iii, seemingly unco-ordinated when the roll is reconstituted with the pieces at the correct level, shows that it took place after col. iii had become separated from the preceding section of the roll. There is another kollesis between columns i and ii, presumably also a manufacturer's kollesis, but damage or repair or both have now rendered the structure complex. The visible surface of the fully preserved middle kollema (with col. ii) measures 17.3 cm.

There is blank space below the text in each of the three columns, but we cannot be sure that there were not other entries after a deep interval; cf. the gaps in **4589**.

As with **4589**, the *apparatus criticus* for the most part only presents the first occurrence of any form of abbreviation, for economy of space.

On the back is **4591**.

## Col. i

[μεμέτρητ]αι καὶ διεστάλ(η) (πυροῦ) (ἀρταβῶν) γενή(ματος) τοῦ  
ἐνεστῶτος ι (ἔτους)

[Μάρκου Αὐρηλ]ίου Σεουήρου Ἀλεξάνδρου Καίσαρος τοῦ

[κυρίου, διὰ ciτο]λ(όγων) λιβ(ός) το(παρχίας), Σενεκελεὺ τό(πων),

Αὐρηλία Ἡρά-

- 5 [κλεια Διογένους c. 5 ] . . . [.]υ Διονυτίου, Σενεκελ(εύ),  
[πόλεως, (πυροῦ) (ἀρτάβας) ἑκατὸν πενήτη]κοντα ἕξ, (γίνονται)  
(ἀρτάβαι) ρνς.  
[Αὐρήλ(ιος) c. 20 ]ριος ὁ καὶ Ἀλέξανδρο[ς]  
[σεση(μείωμαι) τὰς τοῦ πυροῦ ἀρτάβας ἑκατὸν] πενήτηκοντα ἕξ.

Col. ii

- (m. 2) μεμέτρηται καὶ διεστάλ(η) (πυροῦ) <(ἀρταβῶν)> γενήμ(ατος) τοῦ  
ἐνεστῶτος ι (ἔτους)  
Μάρκου Αὐρηλίου Σεουήρου Ἀλεξάνδρου Καίσαρος τοῦ  
10 κυρίου, δι(ὰ) κυτολόγ(ων) λιβ(ὸς) το(παρχίας) Κερκεθύρεως τό(πων),  
Αὐρήλιος  
Ἰερακαπόλλων ὁ κ(αὶ) Ἐπίμαχος γυμν(ασιάρχ-) δι(ὰ) Διονυτίου υἱοῦ  
αἱ διὰ Πισβ(κ) ( ) γεωργοῦ, Κερκεθύρεως, πόλ[ε]ως,  
πυροῦ ἀρτάβ(ας) τριάκοντα δύο, (γίνονται) [(ἀρτάβαι) λβ.]  
Αὐρήλ(ιος) Ἀντωνίου κυτολόγος διὰ [Αὐρηλίου ? Τρύ-]  
15 φωνος τοῦ κ(αὶ) Διογένους σεση[μείωμαι.]

Col. iii

- (m. 3) μεμέτ(ρηται) καὶ διεστάλ(η) {καὶ διεστάλ(η)} (πυροῦ) (ἀρταβῶν)  
γενή(ματος) τοῦ  
ἐνεστ(ῶτος) ι (ἔτους) Μάρκου Αὐρηλίου Σεουήρου  
Ἀλεξάνδρου Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου, δι(ὰ) κυτολόγ(ων) ἄνω  
το(παρχίας) Σκῶ τό(πων), Ἡράκλεια Διογένους, Σκῶ,  
20 πόλεως, ἀρτάβ(ας) τριακοσίας δεκαἕξ, (γίνονται) (ἀρτάβαι) τισ.  
ὀνόμ(ατος) Ἰερακαπόλλωνος τοῦ κ(αὶ) Ἐπιμά-  
χου, σπερμάτων, ἢ αὐτή), πόλεως, ἀρτάβας  
ὀγδοήκοντα μίαν ἡμικυ, (γίνονται) (ἀρτάβαι) πας',  
(γίνονται) ἐ(πι) τό(ξυ) αὐτ(ὸ) (ἀρτάβαι) τρῆς. Αὐρήλ(ιος) Πετοσίρις  
25 κυτολόγος σεση(μείωμαι). (m. 4) Αὐρήλ(ιος) Ἀμμώνιος ἀγορ(ανομ- )  
βουλ(ευτή)ς σεση(μείωμαι) τὰς τοῦ (πυροῦ) ἀρτάβ(ας) τριακο-  
σίας ἐνετήκοντα ἑπτὰ [ἦ]μικυ,  
(γίνονται) (ἀρτάβαι) τρῆς. ///
- (m. 3?) καὶ δι(ὰ) κυτολόγ(ων) τῆς αὐτῆς, Αὐρηλ(ία) Ἡρά[κλεια Διογένο]υς,  
30 Σκῶ, πόλεως, ἀρτάβας π[εντήκοντα ὀκτώ] ἡμικυ,

(γίνονται) (ἀρτάβαι) νησ'. Αὐρήλ(ιος) Π[ετ[ο]ς[ι]ρ[ι]ς(όγος)

σεση(μείωμα).]

δι(ἀ) σιτολ(όγων) τῆς α(ὑτῆς), . . . [

ἀρτάβας x ]

τρῖς, (γίνονται) (ἀρτάβαι) .[. .]. [

Col. i

1 διεστα<sup>λ</sup>2-σ<sup>γ</sup>γενη<sup>τ</sup> ς 3 σιτο<sup>λ</sup>? λι<sup>β</sup>το<sup>τ</sup> το<sup>τ</sup> 4 σενεκε<sup>λ</sup> 5 /σ<sup>σ</sup>

Col. ii

8 ζ<sup>γ</sup>γενη<sup>μ</sup> 10 δε σιτολο<sup>τ</sup> 11 ἱερακαπολλων ο<sup>κ</sup> γυμν<sup>ς</sup> υἱου 12 πιεβ<sup>κ</sup>? 13 αρτα<sup>β</sup>  
14 αυρη<sup>λ</sup> 15 του<sup>κ</sup>

Col. iii

16 μεμε<sup>τ</sup> γεν<sup>η</sup> 17 ενε<sup>τ</sup> 18 δ<sup>τ</sup> 21 ονομ<sup>ς</sup> 22 α<sup>τ</sup> 23 ογ<sup>δ</sup>δοηκοντα  
24 ε<sup>τ</sup> αυ<sup>τ</sup> 25 σεση<sup>τ</sup> αγορ<sup>ς</sup> 26 βου<sup>λ</sup>σε<sup>τ</sup> 28 Ligatured filling strokes follow the  
numeral 33 l. πρεῖς

Col. i

‘Paid in and transferred, in artabas of wheat from the produce of the present 10th year of Marcus Aurelius Severus Alexander Caesar the lord, through the sitologi of the western toparchy, district of Senekeleu, account of Aurelia Heraclia daughter of Diogenes . . . Dionysius, for city dues at Senekeleu, one hundred and fifty-six artabas of wheat, total art. 156. I, Aurelius . . . -rius alias Alexander have signed for the one hundred and fifty-six artabas of wheat.’

Col. ii

(2nd hand) ‘Paid in and transferred, in (artabas of) wheat from the produce of the present 10th year of Marcus Aurelius Severus Alexander Caesar the lord, through the sitologi of the western toparchy, district of Kerkethyris, account of Aurelius Hieracapollon alias Epimachus, (former?) gymnasiarch, through his son Dionysius, for city dues at Kerkethyris, the thirty-two artabas of wheat paid in by Pibekis(?), tenant, total art. 32. I, Aurelius Antonius, sitologus, have signed through Aurelius Tryphon(?) alias Diogenes.’

Col. iii

(3rd hand) ‘Paid in and transferred, in artabas of wheat from the produce of the present 10th year of Marcus Aurelius Severus Alexander Caesar the lord, through the sitologi of the upper toparchy, district of Sko, account of Heraclia daughter of Diogenes, for city dues at Sko, three hundred and sixteen artabas, total art. 316.

‘In the name of Hieracapollon alias Epimachus, seedcorn, for city dues at the same, eighty-one and a half artabas, total art. 81½, sum total art. 397½. I, Aurelius Petosiris, sitologus, have signed.’ (4th hand) ‘I, Aurelius Ammonius, (ex-?)agoranomus, councillor, have signed for the three hundred and ninety-seven and a half artabas of wheat, total art. 397½.’

(3rd hand?) ‘And through the sitologi of the same, account of Aurelia Heraclia daugh-



ter of Diogenes, for city dues at Sko, fifty-eight and a half artabas, total art. 58<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>. I, Aurelius Petosiris, sitologus, have signed.

‘Through the sitologi of the same, . . . three, total art. . . .’

3 For the village of Senekeleu in the western toparchy, see P. Pruneti, *I centri abitati dell’ Ossirinchie* 164–5.

3–4 For the restoration of the name Heraclia see 19.

4 Διονυσίου. Perhaps the name of an agent or tenant, but possibly this could be the same Dionysius as in 11, cf. the suggestion in the introd. above that the two principal figures in these transactions (Heraclia and Hieracapolon) might have been husband and wife.

4–5 Σεκελε(εύ), πόλεως: i.e. Heraclia made a deposit in the granary which was then credited against what she owed in Senekeleu on account of metropolitan taxes, due from her as a metropolitan on account of her landholdings at Senekeleu. Cf. the same system operating with regard to payment of village taxes in the PSI grain account published by R. A. Coles, *Dai papiri della Società Italiana: Omaggio al XXI Congr. Int. di Papirologia* (1995) no. 12, pp. 62–76.

6 It is not clear how we should supplement the beginning of the line. Possibilities include an inset line, or two signatories (with a plural verb in 7).

7 If the supplement is right, cf. 26, it must have contained further abbreviations, probably (πυροῦ) (ἀρτάβας).

10 For the village of Kerkethyris in the western toparchy, see Pruneti, op. cit. 79–80.

10–11 Ἀυρήλιος Ἱερακαπόλλων ὁ κ(αὶ) Ἐπίμαχος γυμνα(σιαρχ-): not in P. J. Sijpesteijn, *Nouvelle liste des gymnasiarques des métropoles de l’Égypte romaine* = *Stud. Amst.* 28 (1986).

12 For the αἰ διά construction cf. O. Ashm. Shelton 24 (interpreted differently from our translation above) and 25. αἰ here must refer to artabas, not aruras as it was understood in O. Ashm. Shelton 24. Cf. also col. v 13 of the PSI grain account published by Coles (see 4–5 n. above), where αἰ is presented probably wrongly as relative αἰ. Cf. also III 533 8 and XII 1530 13.

Following αἰ διά, perhaps a form of Πιβήκις was intended.

19 For the village of Sko in the upper toparchy, see Pruneti, op. cit. 182–3.

Ἡράκλεια Διογένους: a person who might possibly be identified with this one is attested in XII 1537 8 (late second or early third century) as a landowner at Heracleidou epoikion in the western toparchy. PSI VI 713.4 might also refer to her.

20 For the form δεκαεξ see Gignac, *Grammar* ii. 195–6.

22 σπερμάτων. The significance of this is uncertain, but if it refers to the repayment of an advance of seed-corn, then at the standard rate of 1 art./arura the substantial area of 81<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> aruras is involved.

25 We suspect that Aurelius Ammonius did not write all of the subscription 25–8, but it is difficult to be certain which words of it were written for him by Petosiris who wrote 16–25.

25–6 Ἀυρήλ(ιος) Ἀμμώνιος ἀγορ(ανομ-) βουλ(ευτήης): no Ammonius with these titles has been attested before in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*.

29–33 These lines should be by the same hand as 16–25, namely Petosiris, see 31; the script is much smaller and paler than 16–25, but the letter-forms are very much the same.

33 At end, τ[ρὶ]ς might be read, but figures would be expected here, and presumably the sum was larger than 3.

## 4591. ACCOUNT OF ISSUE OF SEED

26 3B.51/J(10-12)b

42.5 × 17 cm

18-22 November 231?

The two columns of this private account of the issue of seed in wheat and lentils stand on the back of columns i-ii of **4590**. Dates covering Hathyr 21-25 of an 11th year are recorded. Phaophi and Hathyr were the usual months of the sowing season (J. Rowlandson, *Landowners and Tenants* 19-20). **4590** dates from the 10th year of Severus Alexander, and more precisely must be assigned within that year to summer 231, see introd. It is most likely that the 11th year here on the back will also be of Severus Alexander, i.e. 231/2; the next 11th year would not be until Gallienus, 263/4. This need not imply that the transactions recorded on **4590** were regarded as waste paper so soon, if these accounts on the back were the memoranda of the person keeping **4590**. The hand of **4591** is different from all of the hands of **4590**. The writing of col. i overruns a vertical repair strip.

The entries are not in strict chronological order and it is difficult at first sight to be sure whether they were written down in the order that the two-column layout (and the presence of the heading in col. i) would suggest. The two earliest days, the 21st and 22nd, appear in col. ii, lines 8-10 in the continuous numeration. In line 8 (col. ii) the name of Heracles is followed by his occupation, ὑδροπαρόχ(ω) 'irrigator', but his name has appeared without qualification already in lines 6-7 in col. i. In line 9 one of the two small sowing areas, because it has an unfamiliar Egyptian name, is described as the ἔδαφος Χβεῖ λεγόμε(νον); it occurs simply as Χβεῖ in 10, as expected, but also in the short form in col. i 6. Moreover, line 3 has no day date, but since it directly precedes the entry for the 23rd, it looks as if it relates to the 22nd and therefore follows on from line 10.

In spite of the confusion of the chronology, the document was probably written consecutively from line 1 to 10, although the anomalies suggest that it was compiled from a document which did follow chronological order. The heading (1-2) refers to an 'account of seed issued by me', but 5 is a sub-heading, 'from the farmstead', which presumably applies to all subsequent entries. The precise distinction remains unclear because of our ignorance of the circumstances, but clearly there were two sources of the seed and two grain accounts to be kept separate, and this version was constructed for that purpose.

The compiler of the account may be the owner of an estate, perhaps the Heraclia or Hieracapollon of **4590**, or more probably one of the managers of such an estate. The two immediate recipients were Diogenes, steward of a small unit of the estate watered by an irrigation machine named after someone called Charion(?), and Heracles, who managed the water supply of an area with the Egyptian name of Chbei. Presumably these two supervised the labourers who sowed the grain in their areas. In chronological order the entries can be tabulated as follows:

Day	Recipient	Place	Grain	Amount	Issued by/from
21	Heracles	Chbei	lentils	art. 14, ch. 2	farmstead
22	Heracles	Chbei	lentils	art. 14, ch. 2	farmstead

22?	Diogenes	Charionis	lentils?	art. 3	me
23	Diogenes	Charionis?	wheat	art. 3	me
24	Heracles	Chbei	wheat?	art. 2	farmstead
25	Heracles	Chbei?	wheat?	art.3	farmstead?
	(through Anicetus)				

The question marks indicate where the information is not specified in the text but carried forward without contradiction from a preceding entry.

It appears that the month was divided into 5-day 'weeks', as often for agricultural work or compulsory dyke corvée. The amounts issued were presumably intended to be sown on the day of issue.

Wheat was usually sown at the rate of 1 artaba per arura, from which we can say that line 4 refers to three aruras of land to be sown with wheat, probably at Charionis(?), mentioned in line 3; if lentils were sown at the same rate and if it is correct to assume that lentils are meant in line 3 because it seems to follow chronologically on 10, there were three more aruras there occupied by that crop. At Chbei lentils occupied at least ar. <sup>3</sup>/<sub>5</sub>; two aruras certainly there were probably sown with wheat (6), three more probably there were probably sown with wheat (7), five aruras of wheat in all. Thus the area concerned at Charionis(?) probably totalled 6 aruras, and at Chbei ar. <sup>5</sup>/<sub>5</sub>. Of course we do not know how much land was cultivated in those places; the work may have extended to other days before or after the week concerned here. Leases mentioned in LV **3803** introd. refer to machines irrigating parcels of 30, 21 and 12 aruras, and a similar machine in LXIII **4390** served 19<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> aruras.

col. i

(ἔτους) ια. λόγ(ος) σπερμάτων ἐξοδια[[ς]-  
σθέντων ὑπ' ἐμοῦ.

Διογένει φροντ(ιστηῆ) εἰς μηχαν(ήν) Χαρι. ν( )

(ἀρτάβαι) γ

κγ. τῶ αὐτῶ πυροῦ

(ἀρτάβαι) γ

5 ἀπὸ ἐποικίου

κδ. Ἡρακλέω εἰς Χβεί

(ἀρτάβαι) β

κε. Ἡρακλέω διὰ Ἀνικήτη(ου)

(ἀρτάβαι) γ

col. ii

Ἀθὺρ κα. Ἡρακλέω ὑδροπαρόχ(ω)

εἰς ἔδαφος Χβεί λεγόμε(ενον) φακῆς

(ἀρτάβης) δ χ(οίνικες) β.

10 κβ. τῶ αὐτῶ φακῆς εἰς Χβεί

<(ἀρτάβης)> δ χ(οίνικες) β.

<sup>1</sup> Λια//λογ  
9 λεγο<sup>μ</sup> χ<sup>β</sup>

<sup>3</sup> φρον<sup>τ</sup> μηχαν<sup>α</sup>χαρι.<sup>ν</sup>

⊖

<sup>7</sup> ανικη<sup>τ</sup>; 1. Ἀνικήτη<sup>ου</sup>

<sup>8</sup> υδροπαροχ

col. i

- ‘Year 11. Account of seed issued by me.  
 To Diogenes, steward, for the irrigation area of Charion( ) (?) art. 3  
 23rd. To the same, wheat art. 3  
 From the farmstead:  
 24th. To Heracles, for Chbei art. 2  
 25th. To Heracles through Anicetus art. 3’

col. ii

- ‘Hathyr 21st. To Heracles, irrigator  
 for the plot called Chbei, lentils art. 1<sup>4</sup>, ch. 2.  
 22nd. To the same, lentils, for Chbei (art.) 1<sup>4</sup>, ch. 2.’

3 *μηχαν(ήν)*: see D. Bonneau, *Le régime administratif de l'eau du Nil dans l'Égypte grecque, romaine et byzantine* 104–5; the meaning of *μηχανή* could be either ‘la terre cultivable irriguée par les appareils en question’, as it must be here, or ‘la saqiā, “roue élévatrice (d’eau) à manège circulaire”’.

*Χαρι.ν( )*: after ρ there is a vertical stroke, followed by a half round stroke like a cup, without joining each other. A reading *Χαρίων(ος)* is probable, but the name *Χαρίων* has not been attested so far in the papyri. Cf., however, Fraser and Matthews, *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* i. 483 (for Andros, Crete, Cyprus) and Pape–Benseler, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen* 1674. For named *μηχαναί* see LXVI **4537** 1–2 n.

4 *κ̄ϛ̄*. The second digit looks at first sight like ε (= 5) but *κ̄ε* occurs below in its proper sequence. Here it seems right to interpret the digit as a cursive ρ in which both elements are rather curved.

6 For the form *Ἡρακλέω* as dative of *Ἡρακλῆς* cf. Gignac, *Grammar* ii. 71; also P. Harr. II 234.

*εἰς Χβεί*: so 10; cf. 9 *εἰς ἔδαφος Χβεί λεγόμενον*. Not attested so far in the papyrus as either a personal or place name. When the field was mentioned for the first time in the papyrus (9; 6 was probably written later in the document from which **4591** was compiled, see introd.), it was named ‘the so called’, *λεγόμενον*. In the Roman period this participle was often attached to Egyptian names, cf. P. Erl. 21.15 and *passim* *λεγόμενον Αἰγυπτιστί*. The name could be a transcription of the Demotic place name *Vby*, attested both in the Delta and Middle Egypt (W. J. Tait); cf. Spiegelberg, P. Loeb, p. x.

7 For the form *Ἀνίκητος* for *Ἀνίκητος* cf. PUG I 22.5. For such insertion of nasals cf. Gignac, *Grammar* i. 118.

8 *Ἡρακλέω ὑδροπαρόχ(ω)*: clearly the same Heracles as in 6–7, but probably this entry was originally written first (see introd.), hence the inclusion here of his occupation.

For the irrigators see R. S. Bagnall, *BASP* 5 (1968) 101–102, with references for *ὑδροπάροχος* and derivatives in the papyri. Add: PSI VIII 947.20, 25 (185/6); PSI XVII Congr., pp. 50–1, 16 (II–III); SB XVIII 13174.12 (258); XLIX **3515** 3; **3516** 3 (both 260–282); PSI VIII 890 ii 24, 33 (III); SB XIV 11908.9 (III); P. Heid. V 344.6, 11 (311); SB XVI 12755.3, 7, 13, 19–20; XVIII 13307.5 (IV); L **3582** 3, 6 (442); **3585** 5 (V); P. Wash. Univ. I 55.4, 5 (V); SB XIV 12050.20 (V); BGU XII 2160.13 (488); 2175.4 (V–VI); P. Vind. Salomons 9.8, 9 (509); P. Strasb. V 486 (549/50); P. Heid. V 352.11 (558); LV **3804** 214 (566); P. Laur. I 7.4 (VI). This employee was a ‘private individual, paid for his services by his clients, cultivators of lands, either in currency or in kind. This private status would not prevent him from working for the public lands’ (Bagnall, op. cit. 101).

N. LITINAS

## 4592. LETTER OF A ROMAN EMPEROR (?)

No inv. no.

14.3 × 14.0 cm, 3.2 × 2.1 cm

Late second or early third century

First published by J. W. B. Barns, 'A letter of Severus Alexander', *JEA* 52 (1966) 141–6, with Pl. XXXV, whence *SB X* 10295; re-editions by J. R. Rea, 'A letter of Severus Alexander?', *CE* 42 (1967) 391–6, cf. P. J. Parsons, 'A proclamation of Vaballathus?', *CE* 42 (1967) 397–401, A. K. Bowman, 'A letter of Avidius Cassius?', *JRS* 60 (1970) 20–6 with Pl. IV, J. Schwartz, 'L'empereur Alexandre Sévère, le *SB X* 10295 et le *P. Fay.* 20', *ζPE* 61 (1985) 122–4. Reproduced as Doc. 185 in J. H. Oliver, *Greek Constitutions of Early Roman Emperors from Inscriptions and Papyri* (Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society 178 (Philadelphia, 1989)).

A medium-brown papyrus written in a hand described by its first editor as 'semi-literary' and 'inexperienced' or 'immature', citing parallels from the second century; judged by Parsons to be more likely early third century (and admitted to be a strong argument against his assignment of the letter to Vaballathus, see below). The letters tend towards uncial forms and are clearly separated. The hand on the verso (which is not necessarily different from that on the recto, *pace* Schwartz, who does not include the verso in his transcript of the text) is the type of 'chancery' hand which is commonly found in addresses from the early third century onwards, though there are examples of this type of hand from the second century (e.g. P. Köln VIII 351, AD 190). On palaeographical grounds it is impossible to assign a date more precise than the late second or early third century.

The text is complete at the left margin and (possibly) at the foot. There are perhaps at least two lines missing at the top (Bowman, p. 21). Since the restoration of lines 7–8 is certain, the approximate number of letters lost in each line can be calculated. A re-examination of the pattern of fibres on the verso confirmed that the small fragment should be placed as in Bowman, Pl. IV, rather than Barns Pl. XXXV.

All commentators agree that the content suggests that this is a letter of an emperor or usurper but the identity of the author has been variously conjectured: a letter of Severus Alexander (Barns, who thought it an autograph); Maximinus the Thracian (Rea); Vaballathus (Parsons); Avidius Cassius (Bowman); Severus Alexander again (Schwartz); Pescennius Niger (J. Spiess, *Avidius Cassius und der Aufstand des Jahres 175* (Diss. München 1975), 54 n. 1, but without any supporting argument). Certainty seems unattainable. The attribution to Avidius Cassius would connect with P. Amst. I 27 (P. J. Sijpesteijn, *ζPE* 8 (1971) 186–92 = *SB XII* 10991), an edict of the prefect Calvisius Statianus, and is accepted by, among others, M. L. Astarita, *Avidio Cassio* (Rome, 1983), 93, and R. Syme, *Roman Papers* v (Oxford, 1988) 689–701, who suggests that Avidius Cassius was born at Alexandria, when his father Avidius Heliodorus and his wife will have accompanied Hadrian on his visit to Egypt in 130 and that he will have been there as a boy during Heliodorus' prefecture of Egypt (p. 696), cf. below, 11–12 n. Schwartz's subsequent attempt to restate the case for Severus Alexander, connecting the promised benefits with the remission of crown-tax proffered in P. Fay. 20,

produced one attractive textual improvement (see 2 n.) but no new compelling or substantive argument. Individual points are dealt with in the notes below, avoiding detailed repetition of the historical arguments set out in *JRS* 60 (1970).

. . . . .

ἸΑλεξαν[δρε]ῖς εν . . [ c. 16 ]  
καὶ παιδ[εῖ]ας επικ[. . .] [ c. 13 ]  
τὴν πρὸ[ς εἶ]μὲ ἐϋνοια[ν] c. 12 ἐν]  
τοῖς στέρνο[ι]ς περιφέροντ[ε]ς τὴν [ c. 5 ]  
5 γνώμην π[αρ]εμείνατε. ἀφικνούμ[αι οὖν]  
πρὸς ὑμᾶς τύ[χ]η ἀγαθῆ, κεχε[ι]ροτονη[μένους]  
μὲν αὐτοκράτωρ ὑπὸ τῶν γενναιοτάτ[ων]  
στρατιωτῶν, ἐπὶ δὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν παρ' ὑμῖν]  
αἰσίως πα[ρ]ελευσόμενος[ς], καὶ ἀφ' ὑμῶ[ν]  
10 μάλιστα ἀρξάμενος τῆς τοῦ εὐ ποιεῖν [ἐξου-]  
σίας, ὅσον δίκαιόν ἐστιν παρέχειν [τῆ πα-]  
τρώα πόλει π[  
[ἐτ]οϋς ᾠ, Φαρμ[οῦθι

Verso:

[A]πολιναρίω \ / βουλευτ(ῆ) πρ . [   
 / \

10 ποιεῖν      Verso βουλευτ

‘ . . . Alexandrians . . . upbringing (?) . . . your (?) goodwill towards me . . . you continued keeping in your breasts the same (?) disposition. I am coming to you in good fortune, having been elected *imperator* by the most noble soldiers. Being auspiciously about to come to power among you and in particular having begun with you in the exercise of conferring benefits, [I will bestow (or ‘have bestowed’?)] as much as is just to bestow on my ancestral (?) city . . .

‘Year 1, Pharmouthi . . .

(Verso) ‘To Apolinarius, councillor, . . .’

1 ἸΑλεξαν[δρε]ῖς: the placing of the small fragment, first suggested by Rea, 391 (cf. introd. above) is the main basis for this reading.

2 παιδ[εῖ]ας: an attractive suggestion of Schwartz, though he does not take account of the trace of the penultimate letter visible on the papyrus. The traces of the fourth letter are compatible with Δ. Understood by Rea and Bowman as from παις but παιδ[εῖ]ας in the sense of ‘upbringing’ or ‘education’ would make particularly good sense in the context of the suggestion of Syme that Avidius Cassius spent part of his boyhood in Alexandria

(see introd.). This interpretation cannot fit Schwartz's reassignment of the text to Severus Alexander; he draws a looser connection between Alexandria and the emperor's second cognomen.

4 At the end of the line Rea offers various possibilities, preferring either τήν[δε τήν] or τήν [αὐτήν]; Schwartz and Oliver restore the latter.

5 π[ρο]ζεμείνατε, ἀφικνούμ[αι νῦν] Schwartz. The traces do not favour π[ρο]ζεμείνατε since there seems to be no trace of ς; there is ink at the left of the ε but the crossbar sometimes protrudes to the left in this hand. The sense would hardly differ; Schwartz translates 'que vous persistez dans les mêmes sentiments'. The reference to a visit could be either actual or promised and is therefore not decisive. There is no evidence for a visit to Alexandria by Avidius Cassius (Bowman, 24) or by Severus Alexander at the beginning of his reign (for evidence of a planned visit in 232/3 see J. D. Thomas, W. Clarysse, 'A projected visit of Severus Alexander to Egypt', *Ancient Society* 8 (1977) 195–207 = SB XIV 11651, P. van Minnen, J. D. Sosin, 'Imperial Pork: Preparations for a Visit of Severus Alexander and Iulia Mamaea to Egypt', *Ancient Society* 27 (1996) 171–81).

6–8 There is a question as to whether δέ after μέν is adversative. μέν . . . δέ may just represent two different aspects of the same situation. However, if adversative, the contrast between election as *imperator* by the soldiers and entering upon ἀρχή is emphatic. In the case of Avidius Cassius the distinction may be explicable by the supposition that the letter was written after he became aware that the rumours of the death of Marcus Aurelius were false (Bowman, 25); Rea (394) notes the possibility that the phrasing suggests a usurper. Schwartz explains it by reference to the distinction between Καίσαρ and Αὐτοκράτωρ made in Severus Alexander's edict on the remission of crown-tax, P. Fay. 20.7 and 11. On the chronology see below, 13 n.

8 ἀρχήν π. [ Schwartz. The justification for reading traces of one or two more letters is given by Bowman, 21 (n. to line 8) and is visible on Barns's original plate. Schwartz suggests π[ύ]των as a possible restoration.

11–12 [τῆ πα]τρίδα πόλει π[: the reasons for the restoration and the explanation of the reference in the context of Avidius Cassius' usurpation are given by Bowman (25), reinforced by Syme (see above). For Maximinus (Rea, 393), the reference would either be a general one to Rome or would reflect a legionary command held by Maximinus in Alexandria; for Vaballathus (Parsons, 398) a reference to Zenobia's claim of descent from the Alexandrian dynasty; Schwartz supposes a weaker and more general reference to 'la métropole' (as if μη-]τρίδα, but there seems to be no parallel for this use with πόλις). At the end of line 12 Barns's edition merely signified the traces, but they support the reading of π; restore either π[α]ρείχον (Rea, Bowman) or π[α]ρέξω (Schwartz, Oliver).

13 The date is between 27 March and 25 April. This would fit the chronological evidence for the revolt of Avidius Cassius, see Bowman, 25; the earliest document certainly dated by his reign is an ostrakon dated Pachon 8 = 3 May (*Bull. Inst. Eg.* ser. 3. 7 (1896) 123), but see now P. Köln II 85 where the probable date is 1 Pachon = 26 April; Marcus Aurelius alone reappears by Mesore 4 = 28 July (O. Bodl. II 1487). The date is also not inconsistent with the chronology of the accession of Severus Alexander, which was on 13 March (Fink, *RMR* 117.I.23–6, the Feriale Duranum); P. Fay. 20, his edict on crown-tax, on which see A. K. Bowman, 'The Crown-Tax in Roman Egypt', *BASP* 4 (1967) 59–74, is dated to Payni 1 = 26 May (cf. Schwartz, 124).

Verso πρε[σβυτάτ(ω)] Barns; πρυ[τάνει] Rea; πρε[σβευτῆ] Bowman. The trace of the last letter allows either ε or γ. There is no evidence for the existence of the term βουλευτής πρεσβύτατος, translated by Barns as 'senior senator'. The restoration by Rea is possible, but the connection with the year 235 is rendered less plausible by the evidence showing that the prytanis at Oxyrhynchus in that year was Aurelius Pecyllus alias Theon. A restoration of πρυ[τανεύσαντι] is possible and would more comfortably allow the argument for a third-century date. The use of the term βουλευτής predisposes in favour of a date after AD 200 (as Schwartz argues) but an earlier date is not ruled out if this text has a connection with Antinoopolis; the strongest argument in favour of this is the possible identification of Apolinarius as an Antinoite councillor (perhaps identical with the Apolinarius of *W. Chr.* 27) and πρεσβευτής, cf. VI 933, see Bowman, 22–3. It would also be possible to restore πρυ[τανικῶ], which is Apolinarius' title in *W. Chr.* 27, but the (admittedly slender) evidence for the titulature of Antinoite councillors does not offer any support for βουλευτής πρυτανικός.

**4593. PETITION TO THE PREFECT CONCERNING A LITURGY**

32 4B.7/K(1-2)

(a) 25 × 11 cm  
(b) 15 × 9.5 cmBetween 206 and 211  
Plate VIII

Several fragments survive which can be combined into two substantial pieces. The larger (a) preserves the top margin and is complete at the right. Fragment (b) belongs below (a) and also preserves line-ends. It is not likely that the two fragments overlap; see 13 n. There is a kollesis 5.5 cm from the right-hand edge. The back is blank. I am grateful to Dr John Rea, Prof. Naphtali Lewis and Dr Rudolf Haensch for discussing its problems with me.

The text consists of a petition to the prefect of Egypt, Subatianus Aquila, in which the petitioner complains that he has illegally been appointed to perform two liturgies at the same time. To this petition he prefaces (as was normal) the imperial directive on which he relied to justify his claim that the action was illegal. He also quotes from a trial before an earlier prefect, Q. Maecius Laetus.

The question of the legality of serving in two liturgies concurrently was examined in detail by Naphtali Lewis in *Atti XI Congresso*, 522–5, reprinted in his *Compulsory Public Services*<sup>2</sup>, 160–2. He concluded that such appointments were illegal at least from the time of Pius and that the illegality was reinforced by Septimius Severus. Whether they were actually illegal at the time of Pius may be disputable. In *Misc. Pap.* (Pap. Flor. VII; 1980), 363–4, I discussed the prefectorial edict PSI XIV 1406 (c. 140) and argued that it related to practices, including the simultaneous performance of two liturgies, which the prefect regarded as inequitable, if others thereby escaped altogether, but which were not necessarily illegal; and I raised the question whether the performance of two liturgies at once did not become illegal until Severus declared it to be so (n. 22). That it was illegal by the time of Severus is asserted in PSI XII 1243.15–18, where the petitioner says *τοῖς κυρίοις ἡμῶν Ἀυτοκράτορι* (i.e. Severus and Caracalla) *ἔδοξεν μὴ ὑφ' ἑνα καιρὸν δύο λιτουργίας τινὰ ἐκτελεῖν*. In the introduction to PSI 1243 the editor says ‘importerebbe invece conoscere la costituzione imperiale che egli invoca, per la quale non era lecito attribuire contemporaneamente allo stesso individuo una doppia liturgia’. It would appear that the imperial pronouncement to which the petitioner of PSI 1243 refers is the one partially preserved in **4593**. It may be worth pointing out that this is not the rescript of Severus reported in Digest L 1.18 (Paulus), *Diuis Seuerus rescripit interualla temporum in continuandis oneribus inuitis, non etiam uolentibus concessa, dum ne quis continuet honorem*. This relates to the performance of successive public services without a break, not to the performance of more than one service simultaneously.

A large number of judicial decisions issued during the visit of Severus and Caracalla to Egypt in 199–200 are attested in the papyri. Additions to the documents listed in P. Col. VI, pp. 27–30, are given in LI **3614** introd. and LXIV **4435** 1 n. Add XLVII **3364** 1–9, P. Stras. IV 224.1–4, and perhaps 254; for SB IV 7366 see W. Williams, *ZPE* 22 (1976) 241, and for P. Col. VI 123 see the revised text by H. C. Youtie republished as SB VI 9526. See also the tables on pp. 27–9 and 123–5 in Jean-Pierre Coriat, *Le prince législateur: la technique*



*législative des Sévères et les méthodes de création du droit impérial à la fin du principat* (1997). Most of these judicial decisions are of the following type: the full imperial titles of Severus and Caracalla, the name of the addressee in the dative (without *χαίρειν*), a brief statement of the Emperors' decision, the posting clause, and the date. **4593** clearly belongs to this type, being particularly similar in format to the decisions quoted in P. Col. 123 and which are there called *ἀποκρίματα*. The precise judicial meaning of this term has been much discussed, see Coriat, *op. cit.* 91–3; he regards an *ἀπόκριμα* as 'un rescrit par souscription . . . une consultation (*responsum*) donnée soit directement par écrit . . . soit oralement, dans un premier temps, puis confirmée dans un écrit — et c'est à cette seconde forme que pourraient appartenir les décisions du P. Col. 123'. In *JRS* 64 (1974) 88–90 W. Williams refers to them as 'subscripts' (cf. also Fergus Millar, *The Emperor in the Roman World*, 244–5), a term which I borrow for convenience. The most remarkable feature of **4593** is that it is said to have been posted at Memphis not at Alexandria. On this see 4 n.

The text is datable to the prefecture of Subatianus Aquila. We know that he was in office by November 206 (for this and subsequent dates in this paragraph see G. Bastianini, *ANRW* ii. 10.1, 512, based on the evidence collected by him in *ZPE* 17 (1975) 305–6 and 38 (1980) 85–6). The latest date for his predecessor (Claudius Julianus) is some time in the Egyptian year 205/6. The last attestation for Aquila as prefect is in January/February 211 and the earliest known date for his successor (L. Baebius Aurelius Juncinus) is some time in the year 211/12. We can slightly reduce the possible time-span since the official complained of was an *ἀμφοδογραμματεύς*. This office had replaced that of *γραμματεὺς τῆς πόλεως* at Oxyrhynchus by March 207 (XVII **2131**), but the latter still existed as late as February 206 (XXXIV **2709**; for the date see XLVII **3346** 1 n.).

The papyrus is all written in the same practised, semi-cursive hand. The similarity of this hand to the one responsible for LXIV **4435** is very close and both could be the work of the same writer. **4435** is part of a dossier on *restitutio in integrum* and is therefore unlikely to have formed part of the same papyrus as **4593**, which appears to be complete in itself (cf., however, 10 n.). If both are in the same hand, this may be because both were written by a clerk in the employ of an Oxyrhynchite lawyer who collected precedents to assist his practice. The papyri make it clear that a large amount of legal business was generated by the judicial pronouncements made by the Emperors during their Egyptian visit in 199–200. For a recent discussion of the views on why these pronouncements are attested with some frequency in the papyri see Coriat, *op. cit.* 624–7.

(a)

[*Ἀντοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ Λούκιος Σεπ*]τίμιος *Κεουήρος* *Ε*[ύς]εβῆς  
 [*Περτί*]ναξ *Κεβαστὸς Ἀραβικὸς Ἀδιαβητικὸς Παρθικὸς*  
 [*Μέγιστος καὶ Ἀντοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ*] *Μάρκος Ἀνθήλιος Ἀντωνῖνος*  
*Εὐσεβῆς Κεβαστὸς Αἰλίῳ Πρίμῳ*. ἐὰν  
 [ c. 15 ]. *ς ἀπ[ο]δ[ε]ξί[. . . .]. τον γεγονέναι, ὁ ἡγούμαινος τῶ*

ἔθνους φροντίει σε τῆς ἐτέρας ἀνεθῆ-  
 [ναι. προσέθη ἐ]ν Μέμφι ἐν τ[ῆ] στ]οῶ τοῦ *Καραπίου* πρὸ πέντε εἰδῶν  
 Δεκεντρίων. vacat

- 5 [Κουβατιανῶ] Ἀκύλα ἐπ[άρχω] Αἰγύπτου vacat  
 [παρὰ c. 8 ]ν *Εὐδαίμονος* ἀπ' Ὀξυρύγχων πόλεως. οἱ κύριοι ἡμῶν  
 ἀήττητοι *Αὐτοκράτορες* *Κεουήρος*  
 [καὶ Ἀντωνίνου]ς ἐπιλάμβαντες τῆ ἑαυτῶν Αἰγύπτω μεθ' ὧν ἄλλων  
 παρέσχον ἡμῖν ἀγαθῶν καὶ τοῦτο  
 [τῷ ἡγουμένῳ τοῦ] ἔθνους διετάξαντο ὥστε μηδένα ὑπὸ τὸν αὐτὸν  
 χρόνον εἰς δύο λειτουργίας ἀναδίδοσθαι  
 [ c. 12 ]. ησας ὁ τῆς [α]ῦτῆς πόλε[ω]ς ἀμφοδογραμματεὺς Ἀπολλώνιος  
 εἰς δύο με λειτουργίας τῷ ἐνε-  
 10 [στώτι (no.) ἔτει ἀνέ]δωκεν καὶ ταῦτα οὐδὲ πλ[ηρώς] ἀντά μαι τὰ ἔτη  
 [. . . . .] [. . . . .] . προτάξας οὖν τὰ θία περὶ  
 [ c. 26 ]ν ἡμῶν α[ c. 30 ]μενον περὶ τοῦ[ c. 6  
 ]  
 [ c. 60 ] διακοῦσαί μο[ν] πρὸς αὐτὸν  
 [ c. 69 ] . μ[ c. 9 ]  
 . . . . .

(b)

- [ c. 45 ] (ἔτους) θ *Κεου[ήρου]* c. 13 ] [. . . . .] [ c. 6 ]  
 15 [ c. 40 ] π]ροσελθὼν εἶπε[ν]· ὀνηλάτη[ς] εἰμ[ί] καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς  
 [ c. 42 ] νῦν εἰς δύο λειτουργίας κατέχῃ; Ἡρων ἀπεκρίνατο·  
 [ c. 38 ] τῆ]ς κώμης. Λαῖτος εἶπεν· ἡ δευτέρα λειτουργία  
 ποταπῆ ἐς-  
 [τιν; c. 35 ] γ]ραμματεῖ πόλεως ε . . [ . . ] . . . . . στις λειτουργί τῆν  
 ὀνηλασίαν  
 [ c. 36 ] μενος οὖν αὐτὸν ὀνηλάτην ὄντα πῶς ἐκάλεις εἰς τῆ[ν]  
 20 [ c. 37 ] μεθ' ἔτ]ερα Λαῖτος Ἡρακλείδην καὶ . . . . α εἶπεν·  
 πόσων κα-  
 [ c. 25 ] καὶ σκεφάμενος μετὰ τῶν ἐ[ν] τῷ συμβ[ου]λίῳ  
 ἐκέλευσεν Ἡρακλείδην καὶ  
 [ c. 46 ] ] γραμματ[εὺς] ἐν πόλεως τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἐπι

[ c. 48 ] . ιου . [ . . . . ] . ομ . [ . ] . . . . πορο . [ . ] . η ἐπὶ τρι-  
[ ] vacat

3 l. ἡγούμενος, φροντίζει      4 l. Μέμφει, Καραπέιου, Δεκεμβρίων      7 l. παρέσχον ἡμῖν      10 l. με,  
θεία      18 l. λειτουργεῖ

‘[Imperator Caesar Lucius] Septimius Severus Pius Pertinax Augustus Arabicus Adiabenicus Parthicus [Maximus and Imperator Caesar] Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Pius Augustus to Aelius Primus. If . . . you prove(?) that you have been . . . , the ruler of the province will take care that you are released from the second one. [Posted] in Memphis in the portico of the Serapeum, on the fifth day before the Ides of December.’

‘[To Subatianus] Aquila, prefect of Egypt, [from . . . ] son of Eudaemon of the city of the Oxyrhynchi. Our lords the invincible Imperatores Severus and Antoninus, having cast their radiance (like the rising sun) over their own Egypt, in addition to other blessings which they have provided for us, have also given this instruction [to the ruler of the] province that no one at one and the same time is to be nominated to two liturgies. . . . Apollonius, amphodogrammateus of the same city has nominated me to two liturgies in the current *n*th year and that too although I have not completed the years . . . . Having quoted above therefore the imperial [decree] concerning [this issued by our lords the Emperors and quoting below the prefectorial minutes of a trial on this subject, I beseech you, most glorious prefect,] to hear me [against him . . . ]’

‘. . . Year 9 of Severus . . . [Heron, son of . . . (?),] coming forward said “I am a donkeyman and the scribes [of the city . . . ] Laetus said “. . . ] are you now under a liability to serve two liturgies?” Heron answered [“Yes . . . ] of the village.” Laetus said “The second liturgy, what does it consist of?” . . . [Laetus said] “Knowing(?) him to be a donkeyman, how could you summon him to the [second liturgy(?)?” . . . After] other matter Laetus said to Heraclides and . . . “How many . . .”, [and after consulting] the members of his council, he ordered Heraclides and . . .’

2 *Αἰλίω Πρίμω*: there is a noticeable gap before and after the name. Quite possibly a freedman, since Primus is a common slave-name. On freedmen performing liturgies cf. XL, p. 4. Was he also a Roman citizen? Lewis, *Compulsory Public Services*<sup>2</sup> 89, comments that ‘second-century documents attest [Roman citizens’] liability for at least some compulsory services (based, for example, on their landholdings)’.

2–3 At the start of line 3 either λ or ω; the former suggests *λειτουργία* or *χρέια*. There is insufficient room for the subjunctive of *δύναμαι* followed by *ἀποδείξαι*, so we should no doubt read *ἀπ[ο]δ[ε]ίξ[ι]ς* after this. The very slight trace before *τον*, a horizontal at the level of the crossbar of τ, is most easily compatible with γ: *εα]υτόν?* ‘If you prove yourself to have been appointed to two liturgies?’ But *ἐὰν εἰς δύο λειτουργίας ἀποδείξῃς σεαυτὸν γεγονέναι* does not sound convincing linguistically (even though these subscripts are no doubt translations from Latin). An alternative, suggested by Lewis, is *ἐὰν [ἐν δυὶ χρεῖαις ἀνόμ]ως κτλ.*, but again the Greek is not attractive.

4 The information that a subscript of Severus and Caracalla was posted at Memphis is new and unexpected. All the other judicial decisions which they made during their Egyptian visit, when the place of posting is known, were posted at Alexandria: VII 1020 6 = LXIV 4435 20, XII 1405 12–13, XLIII 3105 9–10, XLVII 3364 2, LX

**4068** 21, LXIV **4437** 10, BGU II 267.13–14, P. Amh. II 63.6 and 12 (= M. Chr. 376), P. Col. VI 123.1, P. Flor. III 382.4 and 15, P. Stras. I 22.8 = M. Chr. 374, SB XIV 11863.53.

For the Serapeum at Memphis see Calderini–Daris, *Dizionario* iii. 261, and P. Bottigelli, *Aegyptus* 21 (1941) 29–32.

*Δεκεμβρίων*: the spelling may have arisen under the influence of *Septentrio*. The year is not given, but must be 199 so as to fall within the period when Severus and Caracalla were in Egypt. The date is therefore 9 December 199.

The information contained in this line may be relevant to the period of this visit and the itinerary which it followed. J. Hasebroek, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Septimius Severus*, 118–24, proved that the visit took place in 199–200; in particular he relied on seven dated subscripti which all fell between 18 December 199 and April 200. He believed that the Emperors arrived in Egypt not long before 18 December 199. K. Hannestad, on the other hand, in *Classica et Medievalia* 6 (1944) 194ff., argued that the Emperors arrived in Egypt at the very beginning of the Julian year 199. H. Halfmann, *Itinera principum*, 217–21, rejects the chronology proposed by Hannestad, basing his rejection on the evidence of P. Yale inv. 299. In its original publication as P. Coll. Youtie I 30, this prefectorial edict was dated to Pharmuthi (late March–April) of 199. As Naphtali Lewis, *Historia* 28 (1979) 253–4, pointed out, if the Emperor had been already present in the province by March–April 199 the edict would have been issued by him and not by the prefect. In his republication of the edict, however, in *ZPE* 27 (1977) 151–6 (now = SB XIV 12144), John Rea comments that the traces of the month's name which survive are too damaged to permit any sure reading (p. 156 to lines 24–5).

The point should be made that the fact that **4593** was posted in Memphis does not necessarily mean that the Emperors were present there on that date or indeed that they issued this judgement at Memphis. In P. Yale I 61, for example, the prefect states that petitions sent to him (with his *subscriptions*), which have already been on display in Alexandria for *ἀνταρκέειν ἡμέραις*, should now be exhibited in the chora (*ἐπὶ τόπων*). Similarly it is possible that Severus issued all his judicial decisions at Alexandria, but arranged for them to be exhibited also in prominent cities in the chora, of which Memphis would certainly be one. Coriat, however, *op. cit.* 625, states 'Il n'existe aucune preuve qui permette de penser que les rescrits [by which he means here the Columbia *ἀποκρίματα* and similar decisions] étaient comme les édits, affichés, outre à la résidence de l'empereur, dans les cités d'une province.' This suggests that the imperial court most probably was at Memphis when this subscript was posted.

Dio 75(76).13 implies that Severus entered Egypt at Pelusium and states that he travelled up the Nile to the southern frontier. He must therefore have visited Memphis, as the *Historia Augusta*, *Severus* 17.4, specifically says that he did. Hasebroek adduces IGR I 1113, an inscription of 199/200, as proof that Severus paid a visit to Memphis in that year. Halfmann places this visit and the journey up the Nile in 200, after Severus' stay in Alexandria. Hannestad, however, may be right in placing it in 199, before Severus reached Alexandria in December. Hasebroek suggests the Emperors had reached Alexandria before 10 December 199, because an inscription set up in their honour near Alexandria by *decuriones* of two *alae* (CIL III 6581) still records *trib. pot VII* for Severus. There seems, however, to be no compelling reason to draw this conclusion from the inscription. The earliest dated subscript posted at Alexandria is BGU I 267 of 30 December 199 (the place of posting does not survive for P. Flor. 382.17–23, an edict, and 24–26, a subscript, both dated 18 December). But LXIV **4435** 7–12 may prove that Severus had reached Alexandria slightly earlier than this. This section of **4435** records a judgement given in court by an Emperor on 20 December. If the *Καίσαρ* who gives judgement is Severus (as in, for example, XLII **3019**, LI **3614**), which is probable since the lines before this record a judicial decision of Severus and Caracalla, the date is no doubt 20 December 199. As the judgement was given in answer to a petition from Alexandrians, it is most probable that it was given in Alexandria.

We need also to consider the evidence of XLII **3018** 1–10. This preserves imperial pronouncements relating to privileges of the Paenistae. There is a date of *η (ἔτους) Φαρμ(ούθι) ι*, in line 5 and one of *πρὸ ἑπτὰ εἰδῶν Δεκεμβρίων* in line 10. The editor regarded lines 1–10 as a single pronouncement confirming an earlier decision. J. H. Oliver, however, argued that lines 1–5 and 6–10 recorded two separate constitutions (see his republication in *Greek Constitutions*, nos. 241–2). The first was issued in the names of Severus and Caracalla and so, because of its date, must belong, as the editor said, 'to the series which Severus issued during his Egyptian visit'. We do not

know the place and year where and when the second pronouncement was made. Both the editor and Oliver think somewhere outside Egypt probable. If, however, Oliver is right, as he seems to be, that we have not one but two pronouncements, and if he is right in thinking that the second was, like the first, the work of Severus, there must be a good chance that it too was issued during his Egyptian visit. If so it was posted on 7 December 199; we do not know where, but Memphis would make very good sense: the subscript is addressed to Παλαιῶν Ἀρχειούτων πραινοειτῶν, who were associated with the cult of Sarapis at Memphis (see Oliver, 464). It may also be significant that this pronouncement, like **4593** but unlike all other subscripts of Severus issued in Egypt, has a Latin date (the section of **4435** referred to above has a Latin date, as do XLII **3019** and LI **3614**, but these are all judgements given in court by Severus, not subscripts). If it does date from 7 December 199, it, like **4593**, is earlier than any known subscript of Severus posted at Alexandria. A possible scenario would be the following: autumn 199 Severus and Caracalla enter Egypt at Pelusium and travel up the Nile to Philae (possibly, but not necessarily, after a preliminary visit to Alexandria); on their return they hold court in Memphis in early December before arriving in Alexandria later in the month.

5 For the dates of the prefecture of Subatianus Aquila see the introduction.

6–7 SB I 4284, which dates from 207, begins in a very similar way (lines 6–7): οἱ κύριοι ἡμῶν θιότατοι καὶ ἀήττητοι Αὐτοκράτορες Σεουήρος καὶ Ἀντωνεῖνος ἀνατεῖλαντες [ἐ]ν <τῆ> ἐα[υ]τῶν Αἰγύπτῳ, μεθ' ὧν πλεί(τ)ων ἀγαθῶν ἐδωρήσαντο, ἠθέλησαν κτλ. It may be that SB 4284 (now in Cairo) does not need correcting and that the papyrus reads ἀνατεῖλαντες [τ]ῆ ἑαυτῶν; the preposition hardly seems necessary.

7 ἐπιλάμψαντες: for the use of this word in inscriptions see G. Chalon, *L'Édit de Tiberius Julius Alexander*, 97 n. 15. It is always used with reference to emperors or kings. In papyri it is found elsewhere only in BGV VII 1563.15 (also the edict of Alexander), XLVII **3366** 7 and 51, and P. Oslo III 126.5. The editors of P. Oslo 126 adopt Wilcken's suggestion (see line 5 n.) that the imperial pair in their text must be Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus. But all we can be sure of about P. Oslo 126 is that it is later than Hadrian; it is therefore quite possible that this text too is referring to Severus and Caracalla.

8 τῶ ἡγουμένῳ τοῦ ἔθνους: the restoration seems inevitable, cf. line 3.

διετάξαντο: for a similar use of the middle cf. XLVII **3364** 29 and XLII **3025** 5.

9 ], ησας: a word meaning acting illegally, *vel sim.*, seems called for. παρανομήσας, suggested by both Rea and Lewis, may be possible, with, e.g., τοῦτο δέ to precede.

For the bearing the reference to an ἀμφοδογραμματεύς has on the date of the text see the introduction.

10 οὐδὲ πλ[ηρώς]αντά μαι τὰ ἔτη [. . . .]. [. . . .]: πλ[ηρώς]αντα was suggested by Rea. λ fits the traces well, but the first λ in πλ[ηρώς]αντα is difficult as it looks much more like ε. However, we do not want the passive πληρωθέντα. It is not clear what these years are to which the petitioner refers. Years of respite between liturgies would make good sense, supplying ἀναπαύσεως or τῆς ἀνέσεως (for which see Lewis, *Compulsory Public Services*<sup>2</sup> 160–2). However, the trace before προτάσας is not compatible with c; it would suit n, but the plural of either noun is not attractive. Rea wonders whether we should think of τῆς ἡλικίας (the reading α[c] before προτάσας is possible), and points out that this could provide a link between **4593** and **4435** (see the last paragraph of the introduction), since *restitutio in integrum* is particularly applicable to minors.

11 A possible supplement would be τούτου διατεταγμένα ὑπὸ τῶν κυρίων ἡμῶν Αὐτοκρατόρων (the λ is almost certain). This could have been followed by καὶ ὑποτάσας τὸν γενόμενον, with a reference in the following line to the ὑπομνηματισμὸν of Maecius Laetus, quoted in lines 14 ff.

12 There is a small detached fragment reading ]μπροτατ[, clearly some case of λαμπρότατος. It seems quite likely to have fitted somewhere in this line, forming part of an expression such as ἀξιώ σε, λαμπρότατε ἡγεμῶν, εἰάν σου τῆ τύχῃ δόξῃ. If this is on the right lines, the lacuna before it could have been completed by περὶ τοῦ[του ἡγε]μονικὸν ὑπομνηματισμὸν. These supplements have been adopted in the translation.

13 ].μμ[: the first letter might be a 'final' c with a prolonged horizontal, or the horizontal might be a bar over a numeral. The letters following could also be read κα[. διακοῦκαί μου in the preceding line suggests that we are near the end of the petition proper, but the meagre remains in the present line do not suggest any part of the usual conclusions to petitions. It seems impossible to make them fit the end of 14, and it is probably best to assume that at least one line has been entirely lost; cf. also 23 n.

14–15 (ἔτους) θ Ζεου[ήρου] is a reasonably secure reading. Probably καὶ Ἀντωνίου followed, and then month and day. Laetus was in office during the 9th year of Severus (200/201), see Bastianini, *ANRW* ii. 10.1, 512. The date may well have been preceded by ἀντίγραφον ὑπομνηματισμοῦ; cf. P. Fouad 23, which begins with these words, followed by (ἔτους) ητ Ἀντωνίου Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου Φαμ[ενώ]θ κς. Δείος [Ζ]εύξιδος προσελθὼν εἶπεν. No doubt **4593** followed a similar pattern, with the name and patronymic of the plaintiff, Heron, occurring in line 15.

14ff. An interesting comparison for these lines is the trial before Laetus first published by Rea in *JJP* 19 (1983) 91–101, republished as SB XVI 12949.

15–16 Supply πόλεως or τῆς πόλεως at the start of 16. The post of γραμματεὺς τῆς πόλεως had not been superseded at Oxyrhynchus at the time when Laetus was prefect, see the introduction above. But there is of course no reason why this trial should relate to Oxyrhynchus. Heron may be stating that he is a donkey-driver and therefore the scribes have agreed that he should not be liable for any other public service. Alternatively, as Lewis suggests, it may be that he is claiming that as a villager he is not liable to public service in the metropolis: cf. line 17 and SB V 7696.

16 κατέχη: part of a question posed by Laetus. For the passive of κατέχομαι as a technical term meaning that ‘one is obligated to serve’ in a liturgy, see Lewis, *Compulsory Public Services*<sup>2</sup> 61.

17 ποταπή: also used of a liturgy in P. Mich. VIII 492.20–1, εἰς εἰδῆς ὅτι ὁ κομογραμματεὺς ἔβαλέν με εἰς χρεῖαν, δήλωσόν μοι ὅτι εἰς ποταπήν χρεῖαν με ἔβαλε.

18 One would like to read εἶπεν after πόλεως and treat this as a remark addressed to the scribe by Laetus; but this seems to be an impossible reading, nor does it seem possible to read an abbreviated form of εἶπεν.

19 Clearly this is a question put by Laetus and at the start ἐπιστά]μενος is a likely supplement.

20ff. These lines contain Laetus’ judgement. A good parallel is PSI XIII 1326.9–12: μεθ’ ἕτερα Μακρίνος [the prefect] εἶπεν· ‘μεγάλα’ καὶ κειψάμενος μετὰ τῶν ἐν τῷ συμβουλίῳ ἐκέλευ[σεν] Ψάειν ξυν[ληφ]θέντα ἐπι[.]

20–1 Supply κα[κῶν] and treat as an exclamation ‘How many evils have you been guilty of!’? Cf. μέγала used by Macrinus in the passage just quoted.

22 γραμματ[εὺς ὧ]ν πόλεως: an uncertain reading, but good sense as part of an accusatory statement by Laetus to one of the defendants.

23 ] . ιοϛ . [: the traces would suit ]διου[ς]; possibly supply ἐπιτη]δίους (l. ἐπιτηδείους) as Revel Coles suggests. πορο suggests some case of πόρος, ἄπορος, or εὔπορος; the traces are compatible with εὐποροϛ[.]

ἐπὶ τρι-: e.g. ἐπὶ τρι[ετίαν] οἱ, as Rea suggests, ἐπὶ τρι[οῖαν]. Also possible is some form of ἐπιτρίβω or ἐπι-τριβή, on which see P. Turner 41.11 n.

The text poses two problems at the foot, where we have 2 cm blank below 23. (i) There is a trace of ink in the bottom right-hand corner on the edge of the papyrus, 1.5 cm below line 23, which looks like part of a letter. The text cannot have continued for the whole of a second column; indeed it seems to be more or less at an end in lines 23–4 (see below). Is it possible that it was written in two copies (one copy being sent to the prefect and the other retained) and that this trace survives from the second copy? (ii) The judgement given by Laetus could well have ended in the lost part of 24, but one would expect at this point the formal end of the petition, i.e. the ἐπιδέδωκα-clause or equivalent; in SB XIV 12087, for example, after the quotation in a petition to the strategus of a previous petition to the epistrategus and his *subscriptio*, we have a copy of a trial before a prefect, at the end of which the papyrus has Πτολεμαῖος Διοδώρου (= the petitioner) [ἐπή]νεγκα, followed by the date. There is perhaps room for the equivalent of this (minus the date) in the part now lost. Alternatively, and more probably, the ἐπιδέδωκα-clause may have come at the end of the petition proper, in line 13, and before the quotation of the trial before Laetus. There is no sign of the prefect’s *subscriptio*, but by this date petitions to which the prefect had added his *subscriptio* were merely posted up for the petitioners to consult; they were no longer returned to the petitioner: see R. Haensch, *ZPE* 100 (1994) 487–546, esp. 499–504 (his Phase IV). At this period, if the petitioner wanted a written record of the prefect’s *subscriptio*, he had to take it down from the original while it was posted up (e.g. XVII 2131). An apparent exception, XLVII 3364 44–6, can be explained as a copy added to the original petition after the prefect’s decision was known (see Haensch, 528 n. 13).

## 4594. LEASE OF LAND

34 4B.77/A(3-6)a

7.7 × 12 cm

228

Aurelius Diogenes and Aurelius Plution lease seven aruras at the village of Senao to Aurelius Amois. The lease in standard Oxyrhynchite format (cf. e.g. L 3591 introd.) is for one year and stipulates a rent of fifteen artabas of wheat. A current 8th regnal year is referred to in 6. Palaeographically, the text may be assigned to the earlier third century. The 8th year must then be that of Severus Alexander, 228/9 (year 8 of Gallienus may be excluded, see D. W. Rathbone, *ZPE* 62 (1986) 118 and N. Gonis, *ZPE* 123 (1998) 196); since the document was drawn up prior to the sowing season (see 8), its date must be in the autumn of 228. Oxyrhynchite land leases are listed by J. Rowlandson, *Landowners and Tenants in Roman Egypt* 329 ff.; see also 4595 introd.

The back is blank except for some accidental ink marks.

ἐμίσθωσαν Αὐρήλιοι Διογένης  
 Σερήνου καὶ Πλουτίων ἀμφότε-  
 ροι ἀπ' Ὀξυρύγχων πόλεως  
 Αὐρηλίῳ Ἀμοίτι Ἀγαθίνου μητρὸς  
 5 Ταῦσιος ἀπὸ Σεναῶ πρὸς μόνον τὸ  
 ἐνεστὸς ἡ (ἔτος) τὰς ὑπαρχούσας αὐτοῖς  
 περὶ Σεναῶ ἀρούρας ἑπτὰ ἢ ὅσας ἐὰν  
 ᾧσι ὥστε σπύραι πυρῶ ἐκφορίου ἀπο-  
 τάκτου πυροῦ ἀρταβῶν δεκαπέντε,  
 10 ἀκινδύνων παντὸς κινδύνου,  
 τῶν τῆς γῆς δημοσίων ὄντων πρὸς  
 τοὺς μεμισθωκότας κυριεύ-  
 οντας τῶν καρπῶν ἕως τ[ὸν πυ-]  
 ρὸν κομίσωνται. βεβαιουμένης  
 15 δὲ τῆς μισθώσεως ἀποδότω ὁ με-  
 μισθωμένος τῷ μηνὶ Παῦνι τοῦ  
 ἐνεστῶτος ἔτους τὸν πυρὸν [ἐ]φ' ἄ-  
 λῳ Σεναῶ νέον καθαρὸν [ἄδολον]  
 ἄβωλον ἄκριθον κεκοσκι[ευμέ-]  
 20 νον, μέτρῳ τῷ ἐπάνω Διογέ-  
 νους, τῶν παρὰ τῶν μεμισθ[ω-]  
 [κότων



3 οξυρρυγ'χων?      5 ταῦσιος      6 ς      8 l. σπείραι

'Aurelius Diogenes, son of Serenus, and Aurelius Plution, both from the city of Oxyrhynchus, leased to Aurelius Amois, son of Agathinus, his mother being Taýsis, from Senao, for the present 8th year only, the seven aruras (or however many they may be) belonging to them near Senao, to sow with wheat, at a fixed rent of fifteen artabas of wheat, free from all risk, the public taxes on the land being the responsibility of the lessors who are to retain control of the crops until they receive the wheat. And the lease being confirmed, the lessee is to pay the wheat in the month Payni of the present year at the threshing floor of Senao, it being new, pure, free from fraud, free from earth, free from barley, sieved, by the measure which is in the possession of Diogenes, the lessors' agents [doing the measuring . . . ]'

5 For the village of Senao, located in the western toparchy of the Oxyrhynchite nome, see P. Pruneti, *I centri abitati dell'Ossirinchi* 163–4.

8–9 On rent levels see Rowlandson, op. cit. 247ff. Fifteen artabas on c. 7 aruras is a very low rent (2.14 art./ar., approximately); see the table for third-century Oxyrhynchite rents in H.-J. Drexhage, *Preise, Mieten/Pachten, Kosten u. Löhne* (1991) 170. A similar level of rental is found in the Arsinoite P. Mich. IX 565, where H. C. Youtie suggested that the land was of poor quality, see *ibid.* 11–12 n. The same rate is found in P. Köln III 149, on which see Rowlandson, op. cit. 248, suggesting that readiness on the part of the landlords (two minors, in this instance) to accept a lower proportion of the crop might also explain the low rental.

For ἀποτάκτου cf. Rowlandson, op. cit. 241, but the situation there discussed is not the same as here. Further senses of the word are discussed by J. C. Shelton, *ZPE* 86 (1991) 272 with references, A. K. Bowman, *JRS* 66 (1976) 168, N. Lewis, *BASP* 16 (1979) 208–9 and in P. Köln VII 316 introd.

13–14 ἔως τ[ὸν πν]ρὸν κομίσωνται: cf. XXXVI 2795 16–17. Instead of πν]ρὸν, φό]ρον is possible (cf. P. Köln III 149.22–3) but less likely since it usually denotes rent in money, as opposed to ἐκφόριον, rent in kind. For φόρος as rent in kind see also PSI V 468.20–21.

20 ἐπάνω. Not attested elsewhere precisely with a personal name like this. Cf. XVI 1838 2, καὶ μὴ ἐάσει τὸν κύτον ἐπάνω τῶν γεωργῶν, translated 'in the hands of'. Elsewhere ἐπάνω may mean 'aforesaid', cf. e.g. L 3595 49. That sense here would require τοῦ preceding, which cannot be read.

22 The clause is likely to have continued τὴν μέτρησιν ποιουμένων (VII 1040 19) or μετρούντων (P. Oxy. Hels. 41.42).

J. L. MCMILLAN

#### 4595. LEASE OF LAND

22 3B.14/G(7–10)a

6.3 × 32.1 cm

15 October 261

First published by J.-L. Calvo Martínez in *Emerita* 40 (1972) 401–5, reprinted as SB XII 11081; this version is the work of N. Gonis. Several features of the text have been commented on by J. Rowlandson in *Landowners and Tenants in Roman Egypt* (1996), see her 'index of sources' on p. 375.

A consolidated list of Oxyrhynchite land-leases from the first century BC to the end of the fourth century AD is offered in Rowlandson, op. cit. 329–52. Add LXVII 4594 (228), LXI 4121 (289/90), LXIII 4379 (369), 4383 (384), 4384 (385).



The writing is along the fibres. Back blank.

ἐμίθωσεν Αὐρηλία  
 Διονυσία θυγάτηρ Θέω-  
 νος τοῦ καὶ Διονυσοθέω-  
 νος ἀφήλιξ δι' Αὐρηλίου  
 5 Ἀπολλωνίου ἐπιτρόπου  
 Κλαυδίῳ Ἀπελλεῖ τῷ καὶ Ἰσι-  
 δώρῳ υἱῷ Ὠρίωνος οὐετρα-  
 νοῦ τῶν ἐντείμως ἀπολε-  
 λυμένων, εἰς ἔτη τέσσερα  
 10 ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος β (ἔτους) ἀπὸ  
 τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῇ περὶ  
 Σκῶ ἐκ τοῦ Πεδιέως κλήρου  
 βασιλικῆς ἄρουραν μίαν ἡμι-  
 συ τέταρτον ὥστε κατ' ἔτος  
 15 σπεῖρε καὶ ξυλαμῆσε οἷς ἐὰν  
 αἰρήται ὁ μεμισθωμένος,  
 φόρου ἀποτάκτου κατ' ἔτος  
 πυροῦ ἄρταβῶν ὀκτῶ ἀκι(ν)-  
 δύνων παντὸς κινδύνου.  
 20 ἐὰν δέ τις τοῖς ἐξῆς ἔτεσι,  
 ὃ μὴ εἴη, ἄβροχος γένηται,  
 παραδεχθήσεται τῷ μεμισ-  
 θωμένῳ, τῶν τῆς γῆς  
 κατ' ἔτος δημοσίων ὄντω(ν)  
 25 πρὸς τὴν γεοῦχον. κυριευ(έ)τω  
 δὲ τῶν καρπῶν ἕως τὰ κα-  
 τ' ἔτος ὀφιλόμενα ἀπολάβη.  
 βεβαιωμένης δὲ τῆς μισ-  
 θώσεως, ἐπάναγκον μετρί-  
 30 τω ὁ μεμισθωμένος τὸν  
 πυρὸν κατ' ἔτος εἰς τὸ δημό-  
 σιον ὑπὸ τὴν ἐκάστου ἔτους  
 πρώτην μέτρησιν καὶ θέ-

μα τούτων καθαρὸν ἀναδό-  
 35 τω τῇ γεούχω, τῆς πράξε-  
 ως οὔσης παρά τε τοῦ με-  
 μισθουμένου ὡς καθήκει.  
 κυρία ἢ μίσθωσις, περὶ ἧς  
 ἐπερωτηθεὶς ὁ μεμι-  
 40 θωμένος ὡμολόγησεν.  
 (ἔτους) β// Αὐτοκρατόρων  
 Καισάρων Τίτου Φουλουίου  
 Ἰουνίου Μακριανοῦ καὶ Τίτοῦ  
 Φουλουίου Ἰουνίου Κυήτου  
 45 Εὐσεβῶν Εὐτυχῶν  
 Σεβαστῶν, Φαῶφι ιῆ.  
 (m. 2) Κλαύδιος Ἀπελλῆς ὁ καὶ  
 Ἰσίδωρος μεμίθω-  
 μαι τὴν γῆν καὶ ἀποδώ-  
 50 σω πάντα ὡς πρόκειται[ι]  
 καὶ ἐπερωτηθεὶς ὡμο-  
 λόγησα.

6 κλαυδιω: ω corr. from *av*      8 l. ἐντίμως      10 §      13 l. βασιλικῆς      15 l. σπείραι, ξυλαμήσαι  
 18 ακι<sup>—</sup>      22 l. παραδεχθήσεται      24 ουτω<sup>—</sup>      27 l. ὀφειλόμενα      28 l. βεβαιουμένης      29–30 l.  
 μετρείτω      36–7 l. μεμισθωμένου      41 L

'Aurelia Dionysia, daughter of Theon alias Dionysos, minor, through Aurelius Apollonius, (her) guardian, leased to Claudius Apelles alias Isidorus, son of Horion a veteran (of the class) of those with *honesta missio*, for four years from the present year 2, out of her property near Sko from the *kleros* of Pedieus of royal (land) one and three-quarter aruras to sow and to plant each year whatever the lessee may choose, at the fixed rent of eight artabas of wheat annually, free from all risk. And if any (of the land) in the succeeding years—may it not happen!—be uninundated, an allowance shall be made to the lessee, the annual public taxes on the land being the responsibility of the landowner. And she is to retain control of the crops until she recovers the amounts owed to her each year. And the lease being confirmed, of necessity the lessee shall measure the wheat yearly into the public granary at the first measuring of each year, and shall deposit this amount free of all charges for the credit of the landowner, with the right of execution resting against the lessee in the usual terms. The lease is binding, and the lessee, on being asked the formal question about it, gave his assent.'

‘Year 2 of Imperatores Caesares Titus Fulvius Junius Macrianus and Titus Fulvius Junius Quietus Pii Felices Augusti, Phaophi 18.’

(2nd hand) ‘I, Claudius Apelles alias Isidorus, have taken the land on lease, and I shall deliver everything as aforesaid, and on being asked the formal question I gave my assent.’

1–2 *Ἀύρηλία Διονυσία*. The minor Aurelia Dionysia and her guardian are to be recognized in the undated PSI XII 1258, addressed by Dionysia’s mother τῷ τῆς ὀρφανία[ς τῆς θυγα|τρ[ός μ]ου Ἀ[ύρ]ηλιας Διο[υσία]ς ἐπιτρό|πῳ ἀπὸ διαθήκης τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῆς | Ἀύρηλίῳ Ἀπολλωνίῳ Ἀπολλωνίου μη|τρὸς Ζωίδος ἀπ’ Ὁξ(υρύγχων) πόλεως (lines 5–9); in line 6 a photostat of the papyrus, kindly supplied by Prof. R. Pintaudi, indicates that Διο-υ[υσία]ς should be read in place of the edition’s Διογ[ενίδο]ς. Dionysia also appears in a later papyrus, P. Oxy. Hels. 28.2–3 of 303/4, *ὀνόματος Διονυσίας Διο|νυσοθέωνος*; that text indicates that she had a number of employ-ees, cf. LV 3789 introd. (p. 44), which squares with the impression of a woman of property.

2–4 *Θέωνος τοῦ καὶ Διονυσοθέωνος*. In PSI XII 1258.12–14 Dionysia’s father is said to be *Διονυσοθέων ὁ καὶ | Θέων Θέωνος Ματίδιος ὁ καὶ Καλλι|τέκνειος Ἀντινοεύς*. It is tempting to identify him with Aurelius Dionysiotheon *καὶ ὡς χρηματίζει*, ex-gymnasiarch and councillor, who leases out land near Sko in P. Oxy. Hels. 41, of 223/4. But if we are dealing with the same person, it is disconcerting that there is no reference to any of his offices in **4595**, while his Antinoite citizenship credentials are cited fully in PSI 1258. We do of course know of Antinoite citizens who served as councillors at Oxyrhynchus, cf. SB V 7812 (256), XX 14290 (III). At any rate, the Dionysiotheon in P. Oxy. Hels. 41 may well be the same as the ex-gymnasiarch of P. Hamb. I 19 (225), but is probably not identical with the ex-gymnasiarch Dionysiotheon of X **1278** (214); see P. Laur. IV 156.10 n. It is unclear whether he was related to Aurelius Sarapion alias Dionysiotheon, for whose family see U. Wartenberg, *Proc. XLIX Int. Cong. Pap.* (1992) ii. 15–22. PSI Congr. XXI 8.5, of c. 183–4, attests a Dionysiotheon, possibly the son of a Theon (see the editor’s note), but he is too early to be identified with Dionysia’s father.

4–5 *δι’ Ἀύρηλίου Ἀπολλωνίου ἐπιτρόπου*. Aurelius Apollonius son of Apollonius (his patronymic is given in PSI XII 1258.8, see above 1–2 n.) is a well-known figure; the picture that emerges is that of an intermediary in various transactions. Besides being Dionysia’s guardian, he writes on behalf of illiterates in SB VIII 9878.40–45 (259), where he also acts as the *κυρετώς* of a woman, XXXI **2568** 29–37 (264), LVII **3912** 36–45 (266?), and **3913** 5–12 (c. 265); the hand is the same in all four cases (for SB VIII 9878 see the plate in *JJP* 15 (1965) opp. p. 80). It is difficult to tell whether he is identical with the Aurelius Apollonius who subscribes for an illiterate in XL **2892** i 20–2 (269), since the hand of that man cannot be positively identified as that of the ‘son of Apollonius’. He is not necessarily the same as the Apollonius son of Apollonius grandson of Pausirion who appears to have land registered under his name near Peenno in XII **1549** (240). *Ἀύρηλιος Ἀπολλώνιος Ἀπολλων[ ]* in P. Fuad I Univ. 20 (III) may be the same man. It may also be worth noting that an Apollonius appears as the guardian of the orphan Heracleidiaena in LVIII **3923** i (III), and possibly XIV **1637** 4 (256/7–261), cf. **3923** 1–2 n. This capacity would not be out of character for our man. (Ed. pr. suggested an identification with the ex-gymnasiarch, bouleutes and banker Aurelius Apollonius of X **1284** (250), but this is less likely.)

6 *Κλαυδίῳ Ἀπελλεῖ*. This person is not otherwise known.

7–8 *Ὠρίωνος οὐετρανοῦ*. Ed. pr. took *οὐετρανοῦ* as a mistake for *οὐετρανώ*. In consequence, Rowlandson, *Landowners and Tenants* 263 n. 171 notes the ‘unusually high status’ of the tenant; in fact, there seems to be only one other instance of a veteran leasing land, SPP XX 70 (Ars.; 261). But it is likely that there is no mistake involved, and as the grammar indicates, it is Apelles’ father, Horion, who was the veteran. Compare for example VII **1035** 1–3 (143) *Γάιος Οὐετούριος | Γέμελλος υἱὸς Γαῖου Οὐετου|ρίου Γεμέλλου οὐετρανοῦ*, BGU VII 1658.1–3 (234) *Ἀύρηλιος Σερήνος υἱὸς Πουπλίου | οὐετρανοῦ τῶν ἐντίμωσ ἀπο|λελυμένων*, or XXXVIII **2855** 29 (291) [*Ἀρειαν*] *ὅς υἱὸς Ἀρειανοῦ οὐετρανοῦ*.

A veteran Julius Horion occurs in XII **1459** 3 (226), but he is probably not the same person, since we would expect the son to have the same *gentilicium* as the father.

12 *Κκώ*. On the location of the village see F. Gomaà, R. Müller-Wollermann, and W. Schenkel, *Mittelägypten zwischen Samalut und dem Gabal Abu Sir* = *TAVO* B 69 (1991) 74–5.

Πεδιέως κλήρου. This *kleros*, spelled as Παιδιέως, also occurs in VII **1031** 15 (228).

25 κυριευ(έ)τω. The subject of the verb, ἡ γεούχος, has been omitted; for a similar omission see e.g. XXII **2351** 40f. (112).

33–4 θέμα. This expression is discussed by D. Hagedorn, *ZPE* 25 (1977) 197–8, who interprets it somewhat differently.

36–7 παρά τε τοῦ μεμειθουμένου. For this shortened version of the *praxis* clause (reference to ὑπάρχοντα omitted), see XXXI **2585** 18–19 n., P. Mich. XI 610.38 n., LV **3802** 21 n. It appears to be mainly attested in the third and fourth centuries, but actually has earlier antecedents: cf. SB XIV 11279.37 (44) ἔκ τε τοῦ μεμειθωμένου; BGU III 910.2.27 (71) ἔκ τε τῶ(ν) δεδανικμ(έ)νων).

J.-L. CALVO MARTÍNEZ  
N. GONIS

### 4596. APPRENTICESHIP CONTRACT

17 2B.56/F(a)

9 × 17 cm

27 Nov. – 26 Dec. 264(?)

Aurelius Polydeuces agrees to apprentice his daughter to Aurelius Thonis, a ἰστωνάρχηρ, for four years to learn the weaving trade. In a recent study in *Aegyptus* 75 (1995) 95–167 M. Bergamasco recorded 42 examples of apprenticeship contracts (list on 96–8 and analysis on 162–7; cf. also his n. 30); note that his nos. 6, 22, 27 and 31 should be cited as SB X 10236, XII 10984, VI 9374 and XX 15762 respectively. His no. 21 = SB XII 10946 has been re-edited by Th. Kruse, *ZPE* 111 (1996) 149–58; for his no. 2 = BGU IV 1125 see the article by A. Bélis and D. Delattre in *Pap. Lup.* 2 (1993) 103–62. To his list is to be added P. Kell. I 19a Appendix, which needs to be consulted in the re-edition by Bergamasco in *ZPE* 121 (1998) 193–6 (though note that the key words *πρὸς μάθησιν* in line 11 are restored); see also his article in *Aegyptus* 77 (1997) 7–26.

Bergamasco refers to the voluminous literature on this type of contract in notes 2–6 of his article in *Aegyptus* 75. A. Zambon's pioneering study in *Aegyptus* 15 (1935) 3–66 is still of value. Among more recent work note in particular J. Hengstl, *Private Arbeitsverhältnisse freier Personen in den hellenistischen Papyri bis Diokletian* (1972), 83–97, and, for the Byzantine period, A. Jördens, P. Heid. V, pp. 289–95. See also H. Perdicoyianni-Paleologou, *AC* 68 (1999) 149–69. No fewer than twenty of Bergamasco's examples come from the Oxyrhynchite nome. **4596** follows the normal pattern down to line 16: it is an objective homologia, with clauses stipulating that the apprentice should *παραμένειν* with the weaver and arranging for her maintenance. Lines 16–25, however, include an additional clause in which the father agrees that he has received 400 drachmas from the weaver ἐν προχρεία, which he will repay at the end of the period of the apprenticeship.

An advance payment by the master to the parent or guardian of the apprentice is also found in XXXI **2586** 30–4, BGU IV 1124, P. Mich. II 121 recto ii 8 and P. Heid. IV 327. Only in P. Heid. 327 is the purpose specified: in lines 13–15 the guardian agrees to have received from the woman to whom the boy is apprenticed τὰς στα[θείας ὑπὲρ μί] θῶν τοῦ παντὸς [χρόνου δραχμὰς π] (cf. lines 26–8: τὰς τοῦ μισθοῦ ἀργυρίου δραχμὰς [δγ]

δοήκοντα). This contract therefore makes it clear that the money is an advance payment of the apprentice's wages for the five-year period of the apprenticeship, and is so understood by the editor ('Lohnvorschuss') and by Bergamasco, *ZPE* 110 (1996) 174. Bergamasco suggests that the same is true of the sum of 40 drachmas in P. Mich. 121 recto ii 8, but Hengstl, op. cit. 96–7, is right to insist that we do not know the purpose of this payment. BGU 1124 is equally obscure, and the discussion in Hengstl, loc. cit. (who insists that it is not pay in advance) and in Bergamasco, *Aegyptus* 75, 142–3, is inconclusive.

In **2586** 19–30 we have detailed arrangements for the apprentice to earn an increasing wage during his apprenticeship. It is certain, therefore, that the sum of 400 drachmas referred to there in lines 30–4 is not payment of wages in advance, even though it is described as ἐν προχρεία, an expression which can be used of such a payment (see P. Heid. V, p. 159). The editor regards it as 'a loan [which] was part of the terms of the apprenticeship'. Bergamasco (*Aegyptus* 75, 147) says of it 'è lecito supporre che si trattasse di una cauzione, più che di un prestito, volta a rassicurare il padre dell'apprendista circa la correttezza del maestro artigiano'. In this he is apparently following H. J. Wolff, *ZRG* 84 (1967) 414–15, who considered the sum advanced to be 'eine arrhaähnliche Sicherung der Einhaltung des Vertrages durch den Lehrherrn'. As Hengstl, op. cit. 96 n. 101 [where correct 40 dr. to 400 dr.], points out, this suggestion has 'kein Anhaltspunkt'.

In **4596** the sum (400 drachmas as in **2586**) is also not wages in advance, since the apprentice is to receive food and clothing in lieu of wages (line 15), though here again it is described as ἐν προχρεία. It is probably not significant that in **4596** 21 the advance is repayable ἄνευ τόκου, whereas **2586** makes no mention of interest, but other differences are more noteworthy. (1) In **2586** maintenance and clothing are the responsibility of the father and the apprentice goes to the master's workshop on a daily basis; in **4596** the apprentice stays with the weaver day and night, and maintenance and clothing are the responsibility of the weaver. (2) There is no equivalent in **2586** to the phrase εἰς ἀναγκαίας αὐτοῦ χρείας used in **4596** 18–19. (3) The clause in **4596** 21–5, οὐκ ἐξόντος . . . πλήρης, is not found in **2586**. The advance in **4596** thus looks very much like a loan (for προχρεία used of loans see P. Heid. V, pp. 276–9 and 283 n. 54), with the father in effect sending his daughter to work for the weaver as security for the loan's repayment. It is true that for four years she will be trained as a weaver, but she is not at liberty to leave at the end of this period unless her father is by then in a position to repay the sum advanced.

This has obvious similarities with some contracts of παραμονή, e.g. P. Tebt. II 384 and P. Mich. X 589. The relationship between apprenticeship contracts and contracts of παραμονή has been much discussed; for a succinct summary of the conflicting views see Hengstl, op. cit. 96–7. He is inclined to stress the differences, at any rate from a legal point of view, but points out that since both types of document can relate to similar practical circumstances, it is not surprising that they often use much the same language. The situation in **4596** would no doubt have been clearer if the obligations entered into on the part of the weaver and the penalty clauses had been preserved.

The text refers to the current twelfth year. Since the parties are both Aurelii, the reign

can only be Severus Alexander or Gallienus, with the contract to run from 1 Tybi = 27 December 232 or 264. The competent, professional cursive in which the text is written would suit either date, with the later one being slightly preferable. It might be argued that the absence of any arrangements for payment of poll-tax or the tax on weavers supports the later date, but some earlier texts make no mention of such taxes (e.g. IV 725, AD 183). If 4596 does date from 264 it is interesting, but no doubt simply coincidence, that it belongs to the same regnal year as XXXI 2586 (for the correct date see XXXVI, p. 94).

The papyrus is complete at top, left and (for the most part) right, but incomplete at the foot. The ink is often badly rubbed especially towards the right. There are some 18 lines of writing on the back, but the ink is so rubbed and faded as to be illegible.

ὁμολογοῦσιν ἀλλήλοις Αὐρήλιοι Πολυδεύκης  
 Ἀλεξ[άν]δρου μητρὸς Ἀπίας ἀπ' Ὀξυρύχων πό-  
 λεως καὶ Θῶνις Πετε . . . ιος μητρὸς  
 Θαϊκούτος ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως ἰστω-  
 5 νάρχης ὁ μὲν Πολυδεύκης ἐγδεδό-  
 χθαι τῷ Θῶνι τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀφήλικα  
 θυγατέρα Αὐρηλίαν Ἀφροδείτην μητρὸς  
 Διονυσίας πρὸς μάθησιν γερδιακῆς  
 τέχνης ἐπὶ χρόνον ἔτη τέσσαρα ἀπὸ νε-  
 10 ομηγίας τοῦ ἐξῆς μηνὸς Τύβι τοῦ ἐνεστῶ-  
 τος ἰβ (ἔτους), ἐφ' ὃν χρόνον παρέξεται τὴν π[αί]δα  
 ὁ πατήρ παραμένουσιν τῷ Θῶνι οὐκ ὀ(ν)-  
 τα αὐτοῦ ἀπόκοιτον οὐδὲ ἀφήμερον γεινό-  
 μενον, τρεφομένην καὶ ἱματιζόμενον  
 15 ἐπὶ τὸν ὅλον χρόνον ἀντὶ μισθῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ  
 Θῶνιως ὡς ἐν ἀλλήλοις ἐστάθη. ὁμ[ο-]  
 λογεί δὲ ὁ Πολυδεύκης ἐσχηκέναι πα[ρά]  
 τοῦ Θῶνιως ἐν προχρεία εἰς ἀναγκαί[ας]  
 αὐτοῦ χρείας ἀργυρίου δραχμὰς τετρακο[ε]ί-  
 20 ας ἄσπερ μετὰ τὸν τετραετῆ χρόνον ἀποδώ-  
 σαι τῷ Θῶνι ἄνευ τόκου, οὐκ [ἐξόντος αὐ-]  
 τῷ ἐντὸς τοῦ χρόνου ἀποσπᾶ[ν τὴν θυ-]  
 γατέρα αὐτοῦ οὐδὲ μετὰ τὸν χρόνον [ ]  
 πρὶν ἢ ἀποδώ τὰς τοῦ ἀργυρί[ου] δ[ραχμὰς]  
 25 [τετρ]ακοξίας πλήρη[ς]. ὁ δὲ Θῶνις . . . [ ]

4 θαϊκουτος 4-5 ἱτω|ναρχης 5-6 1. ἐκδεδο|ιθαι 10 μηνός: μ corrected, perhaps from τυ  
 11 § 12-13 ὀ|τα; 1. οδαν 13-14 1. γυνο|μένην 14 ἱματιζομενον; 1. -νην

‘Aurelius Polydeuces son of Alexander(?), mother Apia, from the city of the Oxyrhynchī, and Aurelius Thonis son of Peteuris(?), mother Thaisous, from the same city, superintendent weaver, make an agreement with one another that Polydeuces has handed over to Thonis his under-age daughter Aurelia Aphrodite, mother Dionysia, for the purpose of learning the weaving trade, for a period of four years from the first day of the following month Tybi of the current 12th year; for this period of time her father will see that his daughter abides with Thonis, not spending a night or a day away, being fed and clothed for the whole period by Thonis instead of receiving wages, as has been fixed between them. Polydeuces agrees to have got from Thonis a payment in advance for his own necessary needs of four hundred silver drachmas, which after the four-year period he will repay to Thonis without interest; he is not allowed to take away his daughter within this period nor after the end of this period until he repays the four hundred silver drachmas in full. Thonis [agrees . . .]’

2 Ἀλεξ[άν]δρου: reading uncertain, but other personal names beginning Ἀλεξ- are less likely.

3 Πετρε. . . ιος: one expects Πετρεύριος since Πετρεύριος is a common name at Oxyrhynchus, but it is very hard to read the fifth letter as γ.

4-5 ἱτωναρχης: in apprenticeships to learn weaving the master is usually called simply γέρδιος and ἱτωναρχης has not previously occurred in these contracts. The exact function of a ἱτωναρχης is not clear; possibly he was a superintendent of a group of weavers. See BGU XV 2471.5 n, and to the references given there add O. Wilb. 75, introd. In BGU 2471 a ἱτωναρχης reports the name of his new *συνεργός*.

7 The only other certain example of the apprenticing of a daughter is P. Heid. IV 326. The females in P. Aberd. 59 and P. Ross. Georg. II 18.450 could be slaves.

8-9 πρὸς μάθειν γερδιακῆς τέχνης: the definite article is expected and was perhaps just omitted in error; cf., however, BGU XI 2041.5. The weaving trade is, not surprisingly, the one most often found in apprenticeships, occurring in over half of the known examples. For the weaving industry in Egypt see E. Wipszycka, *L'industrie textile dans l'Égypte romaine* (1965), and M. V. Biscottini, *Aegyptus* 46 (1966) 63-5.

9 A four-year term for learning the weaving trade is also found in XVI 1647. On the variation in the period from one to five years see Bergamasco, *Aegyptus* 75, 105 n. 34.

11-14 A clause regulating when the apprentice is to report for work at the master's house is a standard feature of the contracts, see Bergamasco, *Aegyptus* 75, 127-8. Apprentices either report for work each day or, as here, live day and night in the master's house. On the latter arrangement see, apart from Bergamasco, loc. cit., A. Zambon, *Aegyptus* 19 (1939) 101-2, and P. Heid. IV 327.9-12 n. In addition to P. Heid. 327 it is found in P. Oslo III 141.9-10, Stud. Pal. XXII 40.16-18 (see *ZPE* 61 (1985) 88-9) and XXXVIII 2875 12-14. The participle of παραμένειν at this point in an apprenticeship contract is only found elsewhere in P. Fouad 37.4, XXXVIII 2875 10 and XLI 2977 34 (it is often found at a later point in the clause in which it is stated that the apprentice is to remain with the master after the end of the contract to make up any days he has missed). Its use is non-technical, i.e. it does not imply that we have a παραμονή contract (see Bergamasco, *Aegyptus* 75, 127-8).

11 The reading at the end of this line is very uncertain, but there seems to be too much ink for just ἀτήν after παρέξεται.

14-16 On the differing arrangements for feeding and clothing apprentices see Bergamasco, *Aegyptus* 75, 137-40.

15 ἀντὶ μεθῶν: arrangements for the payment of wages to apprentices vary appreciably in the existing

contracts. Bergamasco, *Aegyptus* 75, 140–50, distinguishes no fewer than seven different types. For agreements in which no payment of a wage is specified see 149–50.

16 *ὡς ἐν ἀλλήλοις ἐτάθη*: the same phrase is used in XLIX **3500** 9, a marriage contract.

16ff. On this additional provision see the introduction.

21 *οὐκ* is a very uncertain reading, but it is what we expect at this point.

21ff. It is normal for the parent/guardian to be denied the right to remove the apprentice during the period of the apprenticeship; see Bergamasco, *Aegyptus* 75, 117–18 and n. 66; but the addition of the provision that the father cannot remove his daughter even after the end of her apprenticeship unless he first pays back the sum advanced is not found in any other contracts of this type.

23 No doubt just a short line, since nothing is expected between *χρόνον* and *πρίν*.

24–5 The reading/restoration at the end of line 24 and the first part of line 25 is very uncertain. *πλήρη[ε]*, however, looks secure; for its use with *ἀποδίδωμι* cf., e.g., CPR X 107a.27–8.

The text will have gone on to detail the obligations of the master, in particular that he will guarantee that the apprentice is fully trained by the end of the period.

J. DAVID THOMAS

#### 4597. CONTRACT FOR SUBSTITUTION IN A LITURGY

37 4B.105/B(2–3)b

18 × 25 cm

19 November 294

Aurelius Ptoleminus alias Sarmates, exegetes, councillor and *ἀναπομπὸς ἀχύρου* of Oxyrhynchus, hires Aurelius Demetrammon son of Patermuthius to fill his place in collecting and delivering chaff for cavalry stationed in the Thebaid. Comparable contracts for substitutes and other persons to carry out liturgical obligations include W. *Chr.* 263, 276, 405; P. Leit. 13, P. Mich. XI 604, P. Cair. Isid. 80–82, PSI VIII 873, IX 1037, BGU I 286, P. Fay. 34, and XIV **1626**, XXXVI **2769**, XXXVIII **2859**, XLIII **3095**, LI **3622**, and LV **3796**.

Ptoleminus alias Sarmates was previously known from VI **891** 8 (294) and I **43** recto iv 7–8, v 5–6 (1 and 14 February 295). See LXIII **4383** 4 n. where the documentation probably all relating to a single Oxyrhynchite family is gathered. The two passages cited from I **43** are from receipts issued to Ptoleminus (wrongly given as Sarmates alias Ptoleminus in **4383** 4 n.) for chaff delivered by him in the capacity of *ἐπιμελητῆς ἀχύρου* a few months after **4597** was drawn up; no mention is made of Demetrammon, not surprisingly since this was a private arrangement and as far as the military authorities were concerned Ptoleminus remained responsible, cf. 22. Ptoleminus as *ἐπιμελητῆς* in **43** had three colleagues, but as *ἀναπομπὸς* in **4597** only one (5, 9). Nevertheless, P. Rain. Cent. 83.5, *ἐπιμελητῆς ἦτοι ἀναπομπός*, see n., indicates that the posts of *ἐπιμελητῆς ἀχύρου* and *ἀναπομπὸς ἀχύρου* will have been identical. See further N. Lewis, *Compulsory Public Services*<sup>2</sup> 25–6.

It is possible that the shipment of chaff foreseen in **4597** was not routine but connected with troops sent to Egypt shortly before to settle unrest in the province: on the military occupation in this period see A. K. Bowman, *BASP* 15 (1978) 25–38. The many deliveries of chaff mentioned in P. Beatty Panop. 1 (cf. Index XIV s.v. *ἀχυρον*) were likewise extraordinary, connected with an impending imperial visit.



Written along the fibres; there is a kollesis a quarter of the way along the lines (after πτολ in 14). The back is blank.

- ὑπα[τ]ε[ί]ας τῶν κυρίων ἡμῶν Κων[σ]τα[ν]τινου καὶ Μαξιμιανοῦ τῶν  
 [ἐπιφανεστάτ]ων Και[σάρ]ων.  
 Αὐρήλιοι Π[τολεμῖνος ὁ καὶ Καρ]μάτης ἐξηγη[τῆ]ς βουλ[ευτῆ]ς τῆς  
 λαμ[πρά]ς καὶ λαμ[προτάτης] Ὁξυρυγχι[των]  
 πόλεως καὶ [Δημητράμμω]ν Πατερμουθ[ίου]ν μη[τρο]ς Ἄριστοῦτος ἀπὸ  
 τῆς αὐτῆς  
 5 πόλεως ὁ[μ]ολογοῦσιν ἀλλήλοισι ὁ μὲν Πτολεμῖνος ὁ καὶ Καρμάτης  
 ἀναπομπὸς ἀχύρου ἅμα ἐτέρω  
 συνηλλα[χέναι τὴν κατ' αὐ]τὸν χώραν [τ]ῷ Δημητράμμωνι τῆς τοῦ  
 ἀχύρου  
 παραλήμ[ψεως καὶ ἀνακομι]δῆς ἐπὶ τὴν [Θ]ηβαῖδα καὶ διαδόσιν  
 ἐκείσαι τοῖς  
 τῶν γεν[ναιοτάτων στρατι]ωτῶν ἵππο[ις, ὁ] δὲ Δημητράμμων ἀποπληρώ-  
 σιν ἀμέ[μπτως τὴν ὑπὲρ τοῦ] Πτολεμῖν[ου τ]οῦ καὶ Καρμάτου χώραν  
 τῆς δεδη-  
 10 λωμέν[ης παραλήμψεως καὶ] ἀνακομιδῆς κ[αὶ] διαδόσεως τοῦ ἀχοίρου  
 μετὰ πά-  
 ρης π[ί]ς[τεως καὶ ἐπιμελεί]ας ὀψωνί[ο]ν μ[η]νι[αίου] τῶν συμπεφωνημένων  
 πρὸς ἀλ[λήλους κατὰ μῆ]να ἕκαστον ἀ[ργ]υρίου δραχμῶν  
 τετρακιςχειλίων·  
 ἐντεῦ[θ]ε[ν δ] ἐ[ὀμολο]γ[εῖ] ὁ Δημητράμμων ἐσχηκέναι καὶ πεπληρώ-  
 σθαι παρὰ τοῦ Πτολεμῖν[ου τοῦ] καὶ Καρμάτ[ο]ν μνηδὸς ἐνὸς ἀργυρίου  
 δραχμῶν  
 15 τετρακις[χ]ιλίων κ[αὶ τῶ]ν λοιπῶν ἐ[σομ]ένων μηνῶν ἄχρι τῆς παρα-  
 δόσεως ἀπολήμψεσθ[α]ι καλάρια ὡς [ἐπὶ] ἑκάστῳ μηνὶ δεδῆλωται, ἔτι τε  
 καὶ ὑπὲρ ὅλ[ο]ν τ[ο]ῦ χρόνου ἐκτάκτων οἴνο[ν] κ[ε]ράμια τρία καὶ ὄξους  
 κεράμιον ἐν  
 καὶ ἄρτων ἀρτάβας δύο, ἄ[π]ερ καὶ αὐτὰ ὁμ[ολο]γ[εῖ] ἀπεσχηκέναι·  
 ἀμφότεροι δὲ  
 εὐδοκεῖν ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ ὁ μὲν Πτολ[εμῖ]νος ὁ καὶ Καρμάτης  
 ἀποδώσιν τῶ(ν)  
 20 ἐσομένων μηνῶν τὰ λοιπὰ καλάρια, ὁ δὲ Δημητράμμων ἀποπληρώσιν  
 τὴν χρεῖαν καὶ ἄποχα γραμμᾶτια ἐποίει[ν τῆς] παραδόσεω[ς], τῶν

ἐσομ[έ]ν[ων]

ἐνδεημ[ά]των ὄντων πρὸς τὸν Π[τολεμῖνον τὸν] καὶ Καρ[μάτην].  
 κύριον τὸ ὁμολόγημα διςδὸν γραφὲν [πρὸς τὸ ἐκάτερον] μέρος ἔχειν μονα-  
 χὸν καὶ ἐπερωτήσαντες ἀλλήλους ἀλλ[ήλοισ ὠμολόγ]ησαν.  
 25 (ἔτους) ια΄ καὶ ιʴ [τ]ῶν κυρίω[ν] ἡμῶν Διοκ[λητιανοῦ] καὶ Μαξιμιανοῦ  
 Σεβαστῶν  
 καὶ (ἔτους) γ// τῶν κυρί[ων] ἡμῶν Κων[σταντ]ίου καὶ Μαξιμιανοῦ τῶν  
 2 ἐπιφανεστάτων [Κ]αίσαρων Σε[βαστ]ῶν, Ἀθὺρ κγʹ.  
 (m. 2) Αὐρή[λ]ιος [Π]τολεμῆ[ν]ος ὁ καὶ Καρμάτ[η]ς εὐδ[οκ]ῶ πάσει τοῖς  
 προκειμένοις  
 καὶ [.] .ε[ c. 4 ] .σομ[ c. 4 ] .[.] .[ c. 6 ] τῆς δ[ι]α[δόσεως] ἐπὶ τῆς Θη-  
 30 βαί[δα ]

3 βον<sup>λ</sup> λαμ<sup>ς</sup> twice οξυρυγ<sup>λ</sup> 4 μη<sup>?</sup> 5 First ε of ἐτέρω corr. from τ 7 θηβαῖδα  
 1. διαδόσεως ἐκέισε 8 ἴπποις 8-9 1. ἀποπληρώσειν 10 1. ἀχύρου 12 1. τετρακιςχιλίων  
 15 1. ἄχρη 17 ὑπερ 19 1. ἀποδώσειν τω<sup>τ</sup> 20 1. ἀποπληρώσειν 21 1. ἐποίσειν 25, 26 L  
 28 1. Πτολεμῖνος, πάσι, προκειμένοις 29-30 θηβαῖδα

‘In the consulship of our lords Constantius and Maximianus the most noble Caesars.

‘Aurelius Ptoleminus alias Sarmates, exegetes, councillor of the illustrious and most illustrious city of the Oxyrhynchites, and Aurelius Demetrammon son of Patermuthius, his mother being Aristous, from the same city, [acknowledge to each other], Ptoleminus alias Sarmates, conveyor of chaff, with another person, that he has contracted to Demetrammon his post for the collection of the chaff and its conveyance up to the Thebaid and its distribution there to the horses of the most noble soldiers, and Demetrammon that he will blamelessly fulfil the post for Ptoleminus alias Sarmates for the aforesaid collection and conveyance and distribution of the chaff with all good faith and diligence(?) at a monthly salary of the mutually agreed four thousand drachmas of silver each month; from this (sum) Demetrammon acknowledges that he has received and been paid in full by Ptoleminus alias Sarmates for one month (the salary) of four thousand drachmas of silver, and that for the remaining future months up till the delivery he will receive his salary as has been stated for each month, and further and as special payments for the whole period three keramias of wine and one keramion of vinegar and two artabas of bread, which also he acknowledges he has received. Both parties (acknowledge that they) consent on these terms, and Ptoleminus alias Sarmates that he will pay the remaining salary for the future months, and Demetrammon that he will fulfil the charge and bring back written receipts for the delivery; any deficits that there shall be being the responsibility of Ptoleminus alias Sarmates. The agreement is normative, written in duplicate so that each party may have one copy, and having asked each other the formal question they so declared to each other.

‘Year 11 and 10 of our lords Diocletianus and Maximianus Augusti and year 3 of our lords Constantius and Maximianus the most noble Caesars Augusti, Hathyr 23.’

(2nd hand) ‘I, Aurelius Ptoleminus alias Sarmates, consent to all the aforesaid, and . . . the distribution(?) to the Thebaid . . .’

3 For Ptoleminus alias Sarmates see introd.

4 [Δημητράμμω]ν. Cf. 6 etc. Not in *Namenbuch* or *Onomasticon*. On names in -αμμων see F. Dunand, *Chr. d'Ég.* 38 (1963) 134 ff.

5 There is not room to restore ὁ[μολογοῦσιν here, even if unexpectedly abbreviated ομο<sup>α</sup>. We insert the phrase here in the transcript for the sake of sense, on the basis of an error by homoioarcton. However, most Oxyrhynchite texts of this nature have ὁμολογοῦσιν ἀλλήλοισι NN(1) καὶ NN(2), ὁ μὲν NN(1) συνηλλαχέναι τῷ NN(2), and it may well be that the scribe thought that he had so begun here.

ἀναπομπὸς ἀχύρου. Cf. introd.

6 τὴν κατ' αὐτῶν χώραν. Cf. P. Leit. 13.9.

11 καὶ ἐπιμελεία]ς? The c is very uncertain.

After ὀφίων[ο]ν, μ[ηνι]αίου is a possible reading but it does not obviously add anything to κατὰ μῆ]να ἕκαστον in 12. PSI IX 1037.16–7, ὑπὲρ ζαλαρίων ἧ[τοι ὑπὲρ μισθοῦ, might suggest ὀφίων[ο]ν ἧ [ζαλα]ρίου. If μ[ηνι]αίου is correct, the point of the following κατὰ μῆ]να ἕκαστον might be to say that the salary was not only to be reckoned as a monthly rate but to be paid each month, as opposed e.g. to quarterly payments, but it could be simply tautological.

21–2 It is remarkable that Ptoleminus is required to make up deficiencies in the chaff collection himself: generally, liturgical substitutes were obliged to guarantee that their employers would not be troubled with matters arising from the liturgy, e.g. W. *Chr.* 405, XIV **1626**, XXXVIII **2859**. Cf. introd.

27 Cε[βαστ]ῶν. The same addition to the Caesars' titles in e.g. P. Lips. 4.4, 5.12, I **43** recto iii 18. See R. S. Bagnall and K. A. Worp, *Regnal Formulas in Byzantine Egypt* 9 ff.

28 Since there were two copies (23) and Ptoleminus' subscription is here, presumably this was Demetramon's copy.

29 τῆς δ[ι]α[δό]σεω]ς is no more than a guess, the c–α ductus being particularly dubious.

J. C. SHELTON  
R. A. COLES

#### 4598–4605. OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE AND RECEIPTS FOR MONEY AND COMMODITIES SUPPLIED TO PELUSIUM

119/78, 80, 87–9

Max. height 28 cm

361

Five somewhat shredded pieces preserve parts of eight items from a composite roll of copies of official correspondence and receipts relating to various *annona* and other supplies to Pelusium. A separate publication number is assigned to each of the eight partly separated, partly physically connected items. The numbers follow the order of the pieces in the roll, left to right, as I believe I have established it. This is not the chronological order of the original documents.

The copies can be divided into two groups, **4598–4601** and **4602–5** (but for **4605** see below). **4598** and **4602** are letters to the Oxyrhynchite strategus from an Oxyrhynchite official, attaching accounts of what was delivered (announced but omitted following

**4602**) and then copies of the separate receipts given to him by the Pelusium officials. Each group (excepting **4605**) stands on what was once a continuous stretch of papyrus; the two stretches were then joined, the kollesis coming between **4601** and **4602**. Surprisingly, this is a three-layer kollesis, see **4601** introd.; the vertical fibres of the upper layer have been omitted or stripped for 2 cm.

The strategus is Septimius Apollonius, who has not been attested before. The name is clear in **4602**, less clear in **4598**. The identity of his closest attested predecessor four years earlier is unclear, see G. Bastianini and J. Whitehorne, *Strategi and Royal Scribes* 106. His successor is likely to have been C. Julius Leucadius, also first attested as strategus in documents in this volume and in office from the second half of 362; see **4608** below. Leucadius is currently the last strategus of Oxyrhynchus to be known by name. An Oxyrhynchite strategus is attested in LXIII **4380** of 369, but the name is lost. Septimius Apollonius' attested period in office may be stated as 10 July 361 (**4598**) until some time in October/November 361 (**4602**).

The first of the strategus' correspondents here is Aurelius Eutrygius, son of Leucadius. He is addressed by the Pelusium officials as *πολιτευόμενος* of the city of the Oxyrhynchites (**4600**), but styles himself as ex-magistrate, councillor, and praepositus of the 10th pagus (**4598**; cf. **4599** 9). He has not been attested previously; he is not to be identified with the former *curator civitatis* Flavius Eutrygius, for whom see P. Oxy. LIV Appendix I, p. 229. Nor are there any grounds at present for identifying his father with either the logistes or the prytanis in 325, see P. Oxy. LIV p. 225.

The second of the strategus' correspondents is Aurelius Heraclius, son of Heraclius. He styles himself *πρόεδρος*, **4602**, and this title is used by the Pelusium officials, **4603–4**, but earlier in the same year he is styled prytanis by a different Pelusium official, **4605**. For the apparent equivalence of these titles see A. K. Bowman, *Town Councils of Roman Egypt* 157. No Oxyrhynchite prytanis of this name was known, see the list in Bowman, *op. cit.* 134, 137, nor under the name Claudius Heraclius, which is how Heraclius signs himself (in a large, difficult script) in **4602** 9. This is an extraordinary subscription. It is both the change of name, and its very presence in a different hand in this roll of copy documents, that surprise us. No doubt Heraclius in his official capacity could have access to these official papers, and may have resented the scribe's attribution to him of the gentilicium Aurelius, but there is another possible reason for this autograph subscription. Two sets of copies are mentioned as following **4602**: copies of the receipts issued to Heraclius (line 5), and the accounts of delivery (lines 5–7, *ὅν παραδέδωκα . . . ὡς ἐξῆς δηλοῦται*). These accounts are not present. They would have been introduced by *εἰς* δέ, 8, but (except for the subscription) the sheet is blank below, and the scanty remains of the next item (**4603**) are sufficient to show that this was something else. Were these accounts likewise lacking in the original document submitted to the strategus, and in consequence was the original document without Heraclius' subscription? This would be odd, but it may be that he added his autograph subscription to the copy, by request, in verification; and that he took this opportunity to impose his preferred form of his name.

One should consider the possibility of identity with the Oxyrhynchite strategus of 342, see Bastianini and Whitehorne, *op. cit.* 105 (the date should read 1.3.342), given what we now know about theoretically surprising sequences of appointments in the mid-fourth century (see LX **4086**, **4089**). Since LXII **4344** has shown that Claudius Heraclius, strategus, was the son of a Heraclius, this possibility becomes more likely.

In **4598** Aurelius Eutrygius reports the delivery to Pelusium of 3086 lbs. of pork and (as corrected) 92,200 lbs. (approximately 30 metric tons) of chaff. The receipt for the pork (**4600**) comes from a councillor of Pelusium who is also [<sup>?</sup>ἐπιμελητῆς ἀννωνῶν.

The deliveries announced by Heraclius in **4602** were diverse, with two and perhaps three receipts appended if I have reassembled the roll correctly. **4603** is too fragmentary to reveal what was delivered (indeed, it is largely by analogy that we may classify it as a receipt, while **4604** 1 is a further pointer). **4604** is a receipt for 4 lbs. or more of gold, in payment of the tax called *aurum tironicum* and probably for at least one other tax, its identity lost in lacuna. **4605** is a receipt for a large quantity of denarii, with another occurrence of the puzzling term *μονάς*, to meet the freight charges of flat-bottomed boats (6–7 n.).

Pelusium is described as ἡ Πηλουσιωτῶν μητρόπολις, **4600** 3, as it is in the later P Mich. XVIII 795, and is sometimes given the epithet *λαμπροτάτη* (**4602** 6, **4604** 3). **4600–1** and **4605** now show that it had its own *βουλευταί*. At this date it may already have been the *μητρόπολις* of the province of Augustamnica (so B. Palme, *Ant. Tard.* 6 (1998) 126 n. 15); it was certainly the *μητρόπολις* of Augustamnica I after the division in c. 381–2, see L **3576** with 10–12 n. See also A. Calderini and S. Daris, *Diz. geogr.* iv. 120; H. Gauthier, *Les nomes d'Égypte*, esp. 171.

The motive for these payments to Pelusium remains unclear. We might have expected payment for *aurum tironicum* (**4604**) to be destined for Alexandria, and indeed the destination of the denarii in **4605** is connected with Alexandria in an unclear way. A rapid summary of the imperial situation may illuminate these commodity movements. Constantius II was Augustus, early in 361 engaged in a campaign against the Persians. Julian was still recognised only as Caesar in the East, as is clear in **4598** and **4606**; in the West, where he was in person, the army in Gaul had proclaimed him Augustus in 360 (D. Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle*<sup>2</sup> 323). By summer 361, imperial diplomacy was turning into imperial conflict. The Persians were withdrawing from the frontier area and Constantius was able to return to Antioch and begin co-ordinating troops and supplies for a campaign against Julian. To this end, Pelusium was closer to him in Antioch and therefore perhaps more easily controlled, and it would have been advantageous to change the normal routine of the transportation of grain and other commodities. In November 361 Constantius II was dead, the crisis was over, and in **4608** below of 362 the imperial oath is by Julianus Augustus and the goods are shipped once more to Alexandria.

The five surviving pieces are now separated by substantial gaps, in each of which there must have been a sheet-join, so excluding the possibility of fibre comparisons between the pieces. Nevertheless the way in which the texts are spread across the pieces helps to ensure continuity. Only **4605** is completely independent. **4598–4604** are written in the

same good upright hand, except for the peculiar autograph subscription to **4602**. **4605** is in a different and less formal script. Possibly it does not properly belong to the sequence; its June date looks out of place with the dates (October–November where preserved) in **4602–4**, and the recorded delivery to Alexandria (but this is acknowledged by a Pelusiot) is at odds with the Pelusium delivery indicated for the group by **4602** 6. Aurelius Heraclius is consistently *πρόεδρος* in **4602–4**, but addressed as *πρύτανις* in **4605**. Also **4605** refers to (arrears from) the fourth indiction whereas the others relate to the current fifth indiction (see **4605** 7 n.). On the other hand, the content is closely parallel, the docket (**4605** 1) appropriate, the layout similar, the addressee the same as in **4604**, the inventory number close, and the dimensions and general physical condition of the piece with **4605** are much like those of the other pieces.

Since the hand, **4605** and the **4602** subscription apart, is otherwise the same for the two groups of texts, sent in by different officials, these are not likely to be copies made by those officials; both groups must be copies made in the strategus' bureau. This makes the **4602** subscription all the more extraordinary.

The horizontal measurements throughout the sequence are only approximate, because of the shredded state of the sides of the pieces. The measurements given for **4598** are those of the sheet which also includes **4599**. Furthermore, no measurements are given for **4601** and **4603** because their line beginnings and ends, all that survives, form part of the areas of which the measurements are given under **4600**, **4602**, and **4604**. Only for the piece with **4605** can independent measurements be given.

As well as the join referred to earlier between the document sequences **4598–4601** and **4602** ff., which is on inv. 119/87 between its first and second columns, each of the five pieces of papyrus exhibits one manufacturer's sheet join. Given the substantial gaps between the pieces, each of which must have contained a further join, it is nowhere possible to establish the manufacturer's kollema widths.

The backs of all the pieces are blank.

#### 4598. DECLARATION OF DELIVERY OF PORK AND CHAFF TO PELUSIUM

119/89 col. i

22 × 28 cm

10 July 361

Aurelius Eutrygius declares on oath to Septimius Apollonius, strategus of the Oxyrhynchite, that he has delivered stated quantities of pork and chaff to Pelusium. There is a deep margin below; then the account of the collection of the commodities that were delivered (**4599**) follows immediately to the right, on the same sheet in the same hand.

Where was Eutrygius' subscription? Cf. **4611**, which starts its second column with *ἔστι δέ*, and finishes with *ὑπατείας τῆς προκειμένης*; there the subscriptions must have been at the foot of col. i (lost). Cf. 15 n. below.

I have ignored a lot of scattered ink traces from the mostly lost left side of the document. These survive over an area of shredded and dislocated fibres, and are rarely

identifiable as particular letters. Moreover, the alignment of these traces is not always certain, so that their presence is often of very little help.

[ὕπατείας Φλαουίων Ταύρου καὶ] Φλ[ω]ρεντίου τῶν λαμ(προτάτων),  
 Ἐπειφ ις.  
 [Cεπτι]μ[ι][ω] Ἀπ[ολλων]ίω στρατηγῶ Ὀξυρυγίτου  
 [παρὰ Ἀύρη]λίου [Εὐ]τρυγγί[ου Λευ]καδίου ἄρξ(αντος) βουλ(ευτοῦ)  
 πραι(ποσίτου) ις πάγου  
 [τοῦ Ὀξυρυ]γγί(του). [ὁμολογῶ ὁμνὺς τὸν σεβά]ζμιον θεῖον ὄρκον τῶν  
 δεσποτῶν  
 5 [ἡμῶν Κωνσταντίου αἰωνίου] Ἀνγούστου καὶ Ἰουλιανοῦ  
 [τοῦ ἀνδρειοτάτου καὶ ἐπιφανε]στᾶτου Καίσαρος παραδεδω-  
 [κέναι c. 6 ἐπὶ τῆς λαμπροτ]ᾶτης Πηλουσιωτῶν  
 [μητροπόλεω(?) c. 15 τῆ]ς εὐτυχοῦς πέμπτης  
 [ἰνδικτίονος c. 4 κρέ]ως χ[ο]ίρ[ι]ου λίτρας τριεχιλίας  
 10 [ὄγδοήκο]ντα ἕξ [κ]αὶ ἄ[χ]ύρου λιτρῶν μυριάδων  
 [ἐννέα καὶ διεχιλί]ας διακοσίας, (γίνονται) κρέ(έως) λί(τραι) Ἑπς  
 [ἄχ(ύρου) λί(τραι) ἠ θ Βς,] ἀκολουθῶς ταῖς ἐκδοθείαις μοι  
 [ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀποχαῖς ὡς ἐξ]ῆς ὑποτέτακται ἅς καὶ διαστέλλω  
 [ c. 19 ] . . . καὶ μηδὲν διεψεῦσθαι  
 15 [ c. 24 ] . . .

1 λαμ<sup>ς</sup> 3 ἀρξ<sup>β</sup>βουλ<sup>π</sup>πραι<sup>2</sup> 4 οξυρυγγίς 5 ἰουλιανός 9 λ. χοιρείου 10 λ. μυριάδας  
 11 /κρλ 12 λ. ἐκδοθείαις

‘In the consulship of Flavii Taurus and Florentius, *viri clarissimi*, Epeiph 16.

‘To Septimius Apollonius, strategus of the Oxyrhynchite, from Aurelius Eutrygius son of Leucadius, former magistrate, councillor, *praepositus* of the 10th pagus of the Oxyrhynchite. I acknowledge, swearing the august divine oath of our masters Constantius, eternal Augustus, and Julianus the most valiant and most noble Caesar that I have delivered . . . in the most illustrious metropolis(?) of the Pelusiots . . . for the auspicious fifth indiction . . . three thousand and eighty-six pounds of pork and ninety-two thousand two hundred pounds of chaff, total 3086 lbs. meat, 92,200 lbs. chaff, in accordance with the receipts issued to me by them as subjoined following, which also I will transfer . . . not to have lied . . .’

4–6 For imperial oath formulas see K. A. Worp, *ZPE* 45 (1982) 199–223. Worp does not record this version, which is restored following the consular formula preserved in LI 3622 of 356.

10 *μυριάδων*. Correct to *μυριάδας*. The quantity of chaff is also recorded in 4601 10–11; the transcribed text is an amalgamation of the data in both passages, only importing this correction. The change seems essential,

as otherwise the quantity of chaff might amount to over nine myriads of myriads of litrai (supposing *μυριάδων* in **4601** 10, and squeezing *μυριάδας* in at the beginning of **4598** 11), a quantity of the order of 300,000 metric tons! The amount as corrected is roughly equivalent to 30 metric tons, a more manageable quantity. 3086 lbs. of meat were supplied, see 9–10 and 11 and **4600** 8. This is not the meat:chaff ratio of 1:40 attested by the *mansio* accounts LX **4087–8**, but is close to 1:30. There may be no significance in this; the amounts in our texts may not represent total deliveries, nor would it have been essential that a final ration ratio should have been rigidly maintained by individual suppliers. Indeed, residual stocks in the *mansiones* did not preserve rigid ratios between commodities, nor (because of uneven numbers of men and animals) do the accounts of rations issued; see **4087** 79–83.

<sup>13</sup> For *ὡς ἐξήκει ὑποτέτακται* cf. P. Cair. Isid. 11.9.

<sup>15</sup> A few scattered traces survive on shredded fibres to the left of transcribed ] . . . , cf. introd. The remains are too scanty to establish whether this was a continuation of the text in 14, or whether the otherwise absent subscription of Aurelius Eutrygius might lurk here.

R. A. COLES

#### 4599. ACCOUNT OF PORK AND CHAFF

119/89 col. ii

Account of pork and chaff, which Aurelius Eutrygius appends to his sworn declaration to the strategus of the Oxyrhynchite (**4598**) that he has delivered these commodities to Pelusium. Strictly, these are the accounts of the collection of the commodities, *παράληψις*, cf. LX **4089**. Details of the provenance of the commodities—metropolitans or villagers—and the mechanism of their collection, as detailed in these accounts, would hardly concern the recipients in Pelusium. However, it appears that these accounts doubled as a statement of what was delivered, and no doubt they helped the authorities to keep track of different consignments and maintain quality control.

	ἐξῆτι δ[έ·]	
	κρέως ὑποστάσεως [ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ	λί(τραι) ἸΓπς]
	οὕτως·	
	εἶ'' ἰνδικτίονος	
5	πολ(ιτών)	
	Εὐτρυγιος Λευκαδίου [	λί(τραι) - - ]
	Φλ(άουιος) Σεουηριανὸς δουκῆ[νάριος	λί(τραι) - - ]
	κωμητῶν ὁμοίως	
	ἰς πάγου δι(ὰ) Εὐτρυγίου πρ[α]τ[ῆ] [ποσίτου	λί(τραι) - - ]
10	(γίνονται) αἱ προκ(είμεναι).	
	ἀχύρου ὁμοίως ὑποστάσεως [εἰ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ	λί(τραι) ἧ θ' Βς]
	οὕτως·	
	π[ολ](ιτών) Εὐτρυγιος Λευκ[αδίου	λί(τραι) - - ]



	Φλ(άουιος) Σεουηριαγός [δουκηνάριος	λί(τραι) - - ]
15	κωμητῶν ὁμοίως	
	ἴ' πάγου δι(ά) Εὐτρυ[γίου πραιποσίτου	λί(τραι) - - ]
	(γίνονται) αἱ προκ(είμηναι).	
	5 πολ'      7 φλ'      9 δι'      10 /      προκ'      13 πολ'      14 φλ'      16 δι'	
17 /	πορκ'	

‘As follows:

‘Meat, assessed on property, [altogether 3086 lbs.]

‘Thus:

‘5th indiction:

‘Metropolitans:

‘Eutrygius son of Leucadius [x lbs.]

‘Flavius Severianus, *ducenarius* [x lbs.]

‘Villagers likewise:

‘10th pagus, through Eutrygius, *praepositus* [x lbs.]

‘Total the aforesaid.

‘Chaff likewise, assessed on property, [altogether 92,200 lbs.]

‘Thus:

‘Metropolitans: Eutrygius son of Leucadius [x lbs.]

‘Flavius Severianus, [*ducenarius* x lbs.]

‘Villagers likewise:

‘10th pagus, through Eutrygius, [*praepositus* x lbs.]

‘Total the aforesaid.’

<sup>1</sup> The traces are minimal, but for the presence here of these words cf. **4611** col. ii 1.

<sup>2</sup> *ὑποστάσεως*. Cf. 11. I have found no precise parallels for this usage, apart from **4607** i 10–11, **4611** ii 2, and **4612** ii 2 below. PSI VII 779 uses the word in a similar sense. The expression *τῆς ἐμῆς ὑποστάσεως*, ‘(at the risk of) my property’, occurs frequently in contracts, cf. e.g. LXVI **4536** 29.

<sup>6</sup> Eutrygius son of Leucadius (recurring in 13) is the same person as Eutrygius the *praepositus* (9, 16), cf. **4598** 3. It may be that both he and Flavius Severianus here (7, 14) are functioning as agents in the meat and chaff collection, not themselves as contributors; cf. LX **4089** 33 and introd. This function is made explicit for Eutrygius in respect of the villagers’ contributions by the use of δι(ά), 9 and 16. Doubt, nevertheless, is thrown on this interpretation of the metropolitan contributions by the number of Flavii and officials, seemingly interspersed at random among citizens not so distinguished, in the much longer but similar list **4607** below; it may be that their often higher contributions are simply a consequence of their status. On the other hand, the repeated pairing of Flavius Crescentius and Macrobius (LX **4089** 33; **4607** iii 6–7) seems to hint at an official capacity.

<sup>7</sup> By this date *ducenarii* were low-grade army officers; see Jones, *LRE* ii. 634; cf. LXIII **4381** 2 n.

## 4600. ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT OF PORK

119/88 col. i

22 × 28 cm

14 June 361

This is the first of two receipts, copies of which Aurelius Eutrygius sets out following his declaration to the Oxyrhynchite strategus (4598) and the relevant accounts (4599). Here, a councillor of Pelusium who is also [?ἐπιμελητ]ῆς ἀννωνῶν acknowledges receipt of 3086 lbs. of pork (κρέως χοιρείου, 4598 g). At the right edge of this piece of papyrus are the line beginnings of the second receipt published below as 4601.

ἔστι δὲ καὶ τὸ ἴσον τῶν ἀποχ[ῶν·]  
 [ὑπατεῖ]ας Φλαουῶν Ταύρου καὶ Φλωρεντίου τῶν λαμπροτάτων, Παῦνι κ.  
 [Αὐρήλ]ιος Ἰέραξ Καπρίωνος βουλ(ευτῆς) τῆς Πηλουσιωτῶν μητροπόλεως  
 [?ἐπιμελητ]ῆς ἀννωνῶν δι(ὰ) ἐμοῦ Αὐρηλίου Κλήμη(η) Κλήμεντος  
 βουλ(ευτοῦ)  
 5 [τῆς αὐτῆς] πόλεως Αὐρηλίῳ Εὐτρυγίῳ Λευκαδίου πολιτευομένῳ  
 [τῆς Ὀ]ξυρυγχιτῶν πόλεως χαίρειν. ὑπε[δ]εξάμην παρὰ σοῦ  
 [ὑπὲρ τῆ]ς ὑμετέρας κτήσεως τῆς εὐτυχοῦς πέμπτης  
 [ἰνδι]κτίονος κρέως λίτρας τριχιλίας ὄγδοήκοντα ἕξ, (γίνονται)  
 λί(τραι) ἸΓπς''  
 μόνας ἐκ πλήρους, ἃς καὶ λημματίσω διὰ τῶν μηνιέων μου λόγων,  
 10 καὶ ἐξεδόμην σοι τήνδε τὴν ἀποχὴν πρὸς ἀσφάλειαν, ἐσχηκῶς παρὰ σοῦ  
 τὸ ἀντάποχον, ἥτις κυρία ἔστω πανταχοῦ ἐπιφερομένη,  
 [καὶ] ἐπερωτηθεὶς ὡμολόγησα. Αὐρήλιος Ἰέραξ Καπρίωνος  
 [βου]λ[ευ]τῆς τῆς Πηλουσιωτῶν πόλεως δι' ἐμοῦ Αὐ[ρη]λίου Κλήμη  
 [Κλήμεντ]ος βουλ(ευτοῦ) τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως ἐξεδόμην τὴν ἀποχὴν  
 15 [τῶ]ν τοῦ κρέως λιτρῶν τριχιλίων ὄγδοήκοντα ἕξ μόνων,  
 [(γίνονται) λί(τραι) ἸΓ]πς, ἐσχηκῶς τὸ ἀντάποχον ὡς πρόκειται.

1 ἴσον      2 φλαουῶν      3 ἰέραξ    βουλ'      4 δι' κλημς    βουλ'      8 /λ      9 1. μηνιαίων  
 10 1. ἀσφάλειαν      12 ἰέραξ      14 βουλ'      16 1. πρόκειται

‘And the copy of the receipts as follows:

‘In the consulship of Flavii Taurus and Florentius, *viri clarissimi*, Payni 20.

‘Aurelius Hierax son of Saprion, councillor of the metropolis of the Pelusians, overseer(?) of the annona, through me Aurelius Clemens son of Clemens councillor of the same city, to Aurelius Eutrygius son of Leucadius, *curialis* of the city of the Oxyrhynchites, greetings. I have received from you, to the account of your territory for the auspicious fifth indiction, three thousand and eighty-six pounds of meat, total 3086 lbs. only and in full,

which also I will record as received through my monthly accounts, and having obtained from you the counter-receipt I have issued to you this receipt for (your) security, which is to be enforceable wherever it is produced, and in answer to the formal question I acknowledged. I, Aurelius Hierax son of Saprion, councillor of the city of the Pelusiot, through me Aurelius Clemens son of Clemens councillor of the same city, have issued the receipt for the three thousand and eighty-six pounds of meat only, total 3086 lbs., having obtained the counter-receipt as aforesaid.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>4</sup> *Κλήμη(η)*. For the expanded form cf. line 13. For case-endings of *Κλήμη(η)* (genitive *Κλήμη* not listed) see Gignac, *Grammar* ii. 49.

<sup>5</sup> *πολιτευομένων*. This is now the earliest evidence for this title at Oxyrhynchus. See P. Mich. XVIII p. 321; K. A. Worp, *ZPE* 115 (1997) 201–20, esp. 214–5, with his update in *Chr. d'Ég.* 74 (1999) 124 n. 4.

<sup>9</sup> *μόνας*. The accusative after (*γίνονται*) (8) is standard form. Cf. **4604** 10.

<sup>11</sup> For the *ἀντάποχον* see LXIII **4386** introd. and 5 n.

R. A. COLES

#### 4601. ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT OF CHAFF

119/88 col. ii +  
119/87 col. i

22 June 361

This is the second of the two receipts, copies of which Aurelius Eutrygius sets out following his declaration to the Oxyrhynchite strategus (**4598**) and his accounts (**4599**), the first receipt being **4600** above. Here, five(?) councillors of Pelusium acknowledge receipt of 92,200 lbs. of chaff, roughly 30 metric tons. Only the beginnings and ends of lines survive, on two separate pieces: the beginnings are at the right edge of the piece with **4600** (inv. 119/88), while the end of **4601**'s sheet with the line ends remains attached to the different sequence **4602** and following (inv. 119/87).

This kollesis at the end of the lines of **4601** is unexpectedly a three-layer one, although the relationship of writing to kollesis shows that this marks the end of the first dossier, not a manufacturer's join. A three-layer manufacturer's join, overrun by the text of **4602**, occurs just 9 cm to the right.

[ἄλλης ἀποχῆς τὸ ἀντίγραφον]

ὑπ[ατείας Φλαουίων Ταύρου καὶ Φλωρεντίου τῶν λαμπροτάτων,  
Παῦ]γι κη.  
 Αὐρή[λιοι c. 34 ] καὶ Ἰσχυρίων  
 Α. . [ c. 37 ?οὶ π[ε]γ[ε] βουλ(ευταὶ)  
 5 τ[ῆς Πηλουσιωτῶν μητροπόλεως? c. 20 ?Πηλ]ουσιακ(οῦ)  
 . . [ c. 40 Π]ηλουσιωτῶν  
 Αὐρ[ηλίω Εὐτρυγίω Λευκαδίου πολιτευομένω c. 5 ] . . . . ."

Ὁξυ[ρυγχ- c. 25 ] . . . α. ημεν καὶ ὑπεδεξά-  
 με[θα παρὰ σοῦ c. 30 ] ὑπερ . . . . . —  
 10 τ . . [ c. 25 ἀχύρου λιτρῶ]ν μυριάδας ἐνῆα  
 καὶ δι[εχιλίας διακοσίας, (γίνονται) λί(τραι) ἠ θ' Βς, c. 8 ] . ἄς κα[ὶ]  
 λημματίσωμεν  
 διὰ [τῶν μηνιαίων ἡμῶν λόγων, καὶ ἐξεδόμεθά σοι τα]ύτην τὴν ἀποχ[ῆν]  
 [ c. 23 καὶ ἐπερωτηθέντες ὡμολο]γήσαμεν.  
 Α[ὕρηλιοι c. 40 ] . . . . .  
 15 . [ Scattered traces below  
 . . . . .  
 2 ὑπατείας 4 βουλ' 5 ]ουσια<sup>κ</sup>? 10 1. ἐννέα 11 1. λημματίσωμεν

1 That there was a heading here, centred and now lost, is indicated by the line alignment compared with **4600**. For the form of the heading cf. **4604**.

5 *μητροπόλεως* (or *πόλεως*, **4605**) is not essential; cf. **4602**. On the other hand *λαμπροτάτης* might have been included, cf. **4598**, **4602**, **4604**. How the rest of this line and the next were filled remains a puzzle. There may have been a reference to a presumed relevant function shared by the Pelusiot councillors, for example *ἐπιμεληται ἀχύρου*, cf. **4600** 4 [*ἐπιμελητῆς ἀννωνῶν*]. Alternatively, or in addition (both are present in **4600**), details of an agent may have been given, cf. **4600** 4–5.

7 Aurelius Eutrygius is addressed as *πολιτευομένῳ* in **4600** 5, and describes himself as *praepositus* of the 10th pagus in **4598**. If my suggestion for the end of this line is correct, see below, *πολιτευομένῳ* must be the preferred supplement here.

The remains at the end are scanty and scattered over a tangle of broken fibres. Nothing is clear except the two diagonal strokes at the end. Conjecturally, what was here may have been part of *τῆς λαμ[ ] καὶ λαμ[ ]*, i.e. *λαμ(πράς) καὶ λαμ(προτάτης)*, continuing *Ὁξυ[ρυγχιτῶν πόλεως* in 8. The city is not given its full titulature elsewhere in this sequence of documents.

10–11 Cf. **4598** 10 n.

11 *ἐκ πλήρου*]ς? Cf. **4600** 9. Or *μόνα*]ς, if the preceding numeral were extended.

R. A. COLES

#### 4602. LETTER TO THE STRATEGUS

119/87 col. ii

22 × 27 cm

October/November 361

Copy of a covering letter to the strategus of the Oxyrhynchite from the president of the council which announces the enclosure of copies of (a) an account of deliveries made to Pelusium (*ὡς ἐξῆς δηλοῦται*, 6–7) and (b) the receipts for those deliveries. We expect an account to follow, on a par with **4599** above, introduced by *εἰς δέ* (8), but such an account is not present; there is a deep lower margin, with only Claudius Heraclius' surprising autograph subscription (9) coming below *εἰς δέ*. For this subscription see the general introduction above to **4598–4605**. Immediately to the right, on the same sheet, are the begin-

nings of some lines from the first of the receipts, **4603**; the ends of **4603**'s lines survive on a separate piece which has the left part of the next receipt **4604**.

ὑπατείας Φλαουίων Ταύρου καὶ Φλωρεντίου  
 τῶν λαμπροτάτων, Ἀθύρ.  
 Σεπτιμίου Ἀπολλωνίου στρατηγῶ Ὀξυρυγχίτου  
 παρὰ Αὐρηλίου Ἡρακλείου Ἡρακλείου προέδρου.  
 5 ἴσον τῶν ἐκδοθικῶν μοι ἀποχῶν ὧν παραδέδωκα  
 ἐπὶ τῆς λαμπροτάτης Πηλουσιωτῶν ὡς ἐξῆς  
 δηλοῦται ἴσον ἐξ ὀλοκλήρου ἐντάξας ἐπιδίδωμι  
 ἵν' εἰδέναι ἔχοι σου ἢ ἐμμέλεια. εἰς δέ.  
 (m. 2) Κλαύδιος Ἡράκλιος ἐπιδέδωκα.

1 ὑπατειας      5 1. ἐκδοθικῶν      7 ἴσον      8 ἵν      1. ἐμμέλεια

'In the consulship of Flavii Taurus and Florentius, *viri clarissimi*, Hathyr.

'To Septimius Apollonius, strategus of the Oxyrhynchite, from Aurelius Heraclius son of Heraclius, president. I submit a copy of the receipts issued to me for what I have delivered to the illustrious (city) of the Pelusians as set out below, attaching a copy in full, that Your Grace may be able to know. As follows:'

(2nd hand) 'I, Claudius Heraclius, have presented this.'

4 Aurelius Heraclius calls himself Claudius Heraclius in his subscription, 9: for this oddity see the general introduction above to **4598–4605**. P. Lips. 61 and 62 offer a superficial parallel, but the names there (Aurelius Apis s. of Saitis in 61 of AD 375, Claudius Apis s. of Saitis in 62 of AD 384–5) are consistent within each document, unlike **4602**.

7 ἴσον ἐξ ὀλοκλήρου ἐντάξας. Cf. LXIII **4376** 7–8. Should we print {ἴσον}, so that ἴσον in 5 becomes the object of ἐντάξας rather than ἐπιδίδωμι (cf. XVIII **2187** 11–12, τὸ ἴσον ὑποτάξας ἐπιδίδωμι)? Printing {ἴσον} in 5 would achieve the same grammatical effect. Otherwise, I suppose that two sets of copies are referred to: in 5, the copies of the receipts given to Heraclius, and in 7 the copy of the delivery list, which was never appended.

8 For ἐμμέλεια cf. LX **4089** 8 n., **4091** 6 n. **4602** attests its unqualified use for the strategus, within the limits of our knowledge. For Paeanius (**4089**, **4091**) I supposed that his tenure as *curator civitatis* had entitled him to this honorific abstract, but no other post is known for Septimius Apollonius. Cf. **4607** 8 below, where it is applied to C. Julius Leucadius, strategus, whose only other known appointment was as prytanis.

R. A. COLES

#### 4603. RECEIPT FOR DELIVERY TO PELUSIUM

119/87 col. iii +  
 119/80 col. i

17 October 361

This is the first of the copies of the receipts for goods delivered to Pelusium that Heraclius submits with his covering letter to the Oxyrhynchite strategus, **4602**. **4603** is



abbreviations) and 10, seem to require line lengths substantially longer than the other texts in the series **4598–4605**. At the left are the line ends of **4603**.

A group of three Pelusiots, one or two of them ex-magistrates and at least one of them a χρυσώνης, acknowledge the receipt from Heraclius of upwards of 4 lbs. of gold on account of the *aurum tironicum* tax and at least one other tax. The damage complicates our understanding of the amounts, but I suspect that what was paid was a combination of bullion (4 lbs.) and coins (70 solidi) and that in line 15 (and line 8 also?) the coins were calculated as bullion (11 oz. 16 gr.). Of this grand total, 2 lbs. 11 oz. 12<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> gr. (line 9) was paid for a tax specified in the lost part of line 8; the residue (2 lbs. 3<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> gr.) was on account of the *aurum tironicum* tax, and possibly a further tax if space admitted — comparison with line 10 indicates space for around 35 letters between ἰνδίκτ[ίονος and (γίνονται) in line 9.

I have restored the signatures of the receiving officials in Pelusium (12 ff.) in the same order in which they are named at the beginning of the document, but this is by no means certain, especially if all three held the office of χρυσώνης and not just the last to sign (16, the only place in the text where the title is actually preserved). In two parallel texts, P. Flor. I 95 and P. Lips. 62, there are certainly two and (in P. Flor. 95) probably three χρυσώναι acting concurrently. All of these persons in those texts were πολιτευόμενοι of Antinoopolis; although the post of χρυσώνης was at provincial level, none of them has the gentilicium Flavius. The office is briefly discussed by J. Lallemand, *L'administration civile* 219; see also J. Gascou and K. A. Worp, *Tyche* 3 (1988) 105 ff.

- [ἄ]λλης ἀποχῆς [τὸ ἀντίγραφον]  
 ὑπατείας Φλα[ου]ζ[ω]ν Ταύρου καὶ Φλω[ρεντίου τῶν λαμπροτάτων,  
 month and day.]  
 ἐν τῇ λα[μ]προτάτῃ Πηλοῦ[σιωτῶν (μητρο)πόλει. Αὐρήλιοι x son of x ]  
 καὶ Ποτάμων Ε[ὐτ]υχίου[υ] ἄρξ[(αντες?)] καὶ Μαρρ[ῆς? son of x,  
 χρυσῶναι ἐπαρχίας Αὐγουσταμικῆς?.]  
 5 Αὐρηλίω Ἡρακλ[ε]ίω Ἡρακλείου προέδρ[ω τῆς Ὀξυρυχιτῶν πόλεως  
 χαίρειν. ἀκολουθῶς τοῖς κελευσθεῖσιν ὑπὸ τῆς]  
 ἀρετῆς τοῦ κυρ[ί]ου μου λαμπροτάτ[ω] ἡγεμόνος(?) (name) ὑπεδεξάμεθα]  
 παρὰ σοῦ τὰς ἀποσταλίσας ὑπὸ τ[ ] ?χρυσοῦ λίτρας τέσσαρας  
 ?σταθμῶ καὶ ἐν νομισματίοις?]  
 νομίσματα ἑβδομήκοντα, (γίνονται) χρυσο[ῦ] λ[ί]τραι δ' . . . [ἀπὸ λόγου?  
 χρυσοῦ]  
 λίτρας β' (οὐγκίας) ἰα γράμματα) ἰβδ', τιρώνων τῆς ε[ξ] ['] ἰνδίκτ[ίονος  
 c. 35 (γίνονται)]  
 10 αἱ προκίμεναι πλήρης μόνας ἄς καὶ λημ[ματίσομεν διὰ τῶν μηνιαίων  
 ἡμῶν λόγων καὶ ἐξεδόμεθά]

κοι τὴν ἀποχὴν ἐσχηκότες παρὰ σοῦ τὸ [ἀντάποχον ]  
 ἀποχὴν ἐπιφερομένην πανταχοῦ[ῦ Αὐρήλιος x χρυσώνης  
 ὑπεδεξάμην]  
 [τ]ὰς προκιμένας τοῦ χρυσοῦ λίτρας τξ[ccaras ?σταθμῶ και ἐν  
 νομισματίοις? νομίματα]  
 ἐβδομήκοντα ὡς πρόκειται. Αὐρήλι[ο]ς Ποτάμμων(?) χρυσώνης  
 cunvπεδεξάμην ]  
 15 τοῦ χρυσοῦ λιτρῶν τεσσάρων οὐγκι[ῶν ια γραμμάτων ις? Αὐρήλιος  
 Μαρρή[ς?]  
 χρυσώνης cunvπεδεξάμην . . [

2 ὑπατείας                      4 ἀρξ[']?                      6 l. ἡμῶν                      7 l. ἀποσταλείας                      ὑπο                      8 / λ?  
 9 λ    π    γρ[']                      ἰνδικτιονος?                      10 l. προκείμεναι                      13 l. προκειμένας                      14 l. πρόκειται  
 16 cunvπεδεξάμην

‘[Copy] of another receipt.

‘In the consulship of Flavii Taurus and Florentius, *virii clarissimi*, [month & day]; in the most illustrious city of the Pelusiots. Aurelii x son of x and Potammon son of Eutychius, former magistrates, and Marres(?) son of x, *chrysonai* of the province of Augustamnica(?), to Aurelius Heraclius son of Heraclius, president of the city of the Oxyrhynchites, greetings. In accordance with the orders of the Virtue of my lord . . . , *vir clarissimus, praeses*(?), we have received from you the [four pounds of gold ?by weight and in coinage?] seventy solidi, dispatched by . . . , total 4 lbs. . . . of gold: [?on account of (*name of tax*)] 2 lbs. 11 oz. 12<sup>14</sup> gr. [of gold], for recruits-tax for the 5th indiction . . . , total the aforesaid, in full and no more, which also we will record as received through our monthly accounts, and we have issued the receipt to you, having obtained from you [the counter-receipt] . . . the receipt, wherever it is produced . . . [I, Aurelius x, *chrysones*, have received] the aforesaid four pounds of gold [by weight, and in coinage?] seventy [solidi] as aforesaid. I, Aurelius [Potammon(?), *chrysones*, have jointly received . . .] four pounds [11] ounces [16 grams(?)] of gold. I, Aurelius Marres(?), *chrysones*, have jointly received . . .’

3 The entire transcript is extremely hazardous, apart from initial ε. Beyond Πηλου[ a few indeterminate traces are visible on loose fibres. None of the other receipts in this series opens with a location like this, as far as can be seen, although **4603** (see 2 n.) may have had something similar.

4 *Μαρρή[ς?* That name is predominantly Arsinoite, within the limits of our documentation. Our knowledge of the onomastics of Pelusium is understandably limited; note, for example, the previously unattested name Διονυ(σο?)κάκιος in **4605** 3.

6 ἀρετῆς. See LIV **3758** 14 n., where officials to whom the word was applied were given as prefect, *praeses, rationalis* and *dux*. The official in **4604** is styled *λαμπρότατος*, but that in itself does not allow us any further to restrict the possibilities. P. Lips. 61 and 62, comparable texts, refer to the orders of the *praeses* at this point. On that basis, the official here would be the *praeses* of Augustamnica; a *praeses* of Augustamnica attested in office in 361 is *Εὐθῆριος*; see B. Palme, *Ant. Tard.* 6 (1998) 134.



10 πλήρης is treated as indeclinable, cf. LI 3637 8 n.; accusative μόνας is also standard, cf. 4600 9 n.

R. A. COLES

## 4605. RECEIPT FOR MONADS OF DENARII IN ALEXANDRIA

119/78

22 × 24.5 cm

29 June 361

This item is almost complete, and stands alone on its papyrus sheet. A councillor of Pelusium, Aurelius Posis, who is also a banker in Alexandria, acknowledges receipt from Aurelius Heraclius of a large quantity of denarii for arrears of the freight charges of flat-bottomed boats. The denarii are reckoned in terms of the puzzling word *μονάς*, for which see R. A. Coles, ‘What is a *monad*?’, in *Atti del XXII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia*, forthcoming.

The script is different from that of 4598–4604; for this and other topics see the general introduction to 4598–4605 above. It may be noted that, although Posis declares that he wrote the entire receipt (9), this is irrelevant to a consideration of 4605’s different script, since 4605’s docket (1) formally describes the document as a copy. The docket itself is in the same hand as the body of the text.

The lower half of the sheet is blank. There is a kollesis almost down the centre of the sheet. In the lower margin, what at first looks like another kollesis just 1 cm to the left is in reality just a crease.

- (m. 3) ἄλλης ὁμοίως τὸ ἀντίγραφον)  
 ὑπατείας Φλαουίων Ταύρου καὶ Φλωρεντίου τῶν λαμ(προτάτων),  
 Ἐπεὶφ ε.  
 Αὐρήλιος Πόσις Διονυκαίου βουλευτῆς τῆς Πηλουσιώτων πόλε[ωσ c. 7 ]  
 [τραπ]εξίτης Ἀλεξανδρείας Αὐρηλίω Ἡρακλείω Ἡρακλείου πρυτάνει  
 [τῆς]  
 5 [Ῥξυ]ρνηχιδῶν πόλεως χαίρειν. ὁμολογῶ ἐσχηκέναι καὶ ὑποδ[εδέχθαι  
 παρὰ]  
 σοῦ ἐν [τ]ῇ κατὰ Ἀλεξάνδρειαν δημοσίᾳ τραπέζῃ ὑπὲρ ναύλων  
 πλ[ατυπηγί-]  
 [ων] πλοίων ἀπὸ λόγου τετάρτης ἰνδικτίονος ἀργυρίου Σεβαστῶν  
 νομ[ίσματος]  
 δη[να]ρίων μυριάδων μονάδας ἑπτὰ ἐκ πλήρους καὶ ἐξεδόμην ς[οι  
 τήνδε τήν]  
 ἀποχὴν βεβαίαν καὶ κυρίαν οὐσαν ἐμοῦ τοῦ Πόσις ὀλόγραφον καὶ  
 ἐ[περωτηθεὶς]

10 ὥμο[λ]όγησα. Αὐρήλιος Πόσις ὁ προκείμενος ἐξεδόμην τὴν ἀπ[οχὴν ὡς]  
πρόκειται.

1  $\chi$       2 λαμ)      3 βου λευτης; the writer has left a gap at the kollesis. Gaps at the kollesis also occur  
in 4 and 5      4 1. *τραπεζίτης*      5 A spot of ink before *υπ-*; *ὑπ-* intended?      6 *η* of *δημοσία* re-inked  
on faulty papyrus surface      10 1. *προκείμενος*

(3rd hand) ‘Copy of another likewise.

‘In the consulship of Flavii Taurus and Florentius, *viri clarissimi*, Epeiph 5.

‘Aurelius Posis son of Dionycasius, councillor of the city of the Pelusians, . . . banker of Alexandria, to Aurelius Heraclius son of Heraclius, prytanis of the city of the Oxyrhynchites, greetings. I acknowledge that I have had and received from you in the state bank at Alexandria, in respect of the freight charges of flat-bottomed boats, from the account of the fourth indiction, seven monads of myriads of denarii of money of the coinage of the Augusti, in full, and I have issued this receipt to you, being guaranteed and enforceable, all written by me Posis, and in answer to the formal question I acknowledged. I, Aurelius Posis the aforesaid, have issued the receipt as aforesaid.’

3 The name Dionycasius has not been attested before. Conceivably we should correct to (an equally unattested) *Διονν(σο)κασίου*.

No doubt Posis was a public banker, and the lacuna at the end of this line will have the expression defining *τραπεζίτης* (4). Obviously *δημόσιος* will fit, but see J. D. Thomas, *JCS* 28 (1985) 119, pointing out the change of title to *δημοσίων χρημάτων τραπεζίτης* by the first decade of the fourth century. That would require abbreviations, not employed in this text except in lines 1–2.

6 *κατὰ Ἀλεξάνδρειαν*. Cf. P. Turner 45.4–5 n.

6–7 For flat-bottomed boats cf. LI **3636** 1 and n.; LXII **4348** 6 and n. The amount here (perhaps to be understood as the equivalent in denarii of 35 solidi, cf. the near-contemporary P. Oslo III 162) is much less than the 298 solidi assessed on the Oxyrhynchite nome in **3636**. There are several possible reasons. (1) The assessment here may be on the city only; **3636** refers to the assessment for the whole nome. (The deliveries recorded in **4598–4601** above are presumably derived from just the 10th pagus, albeit from both metropolitan residents and villagers.) (2) The amount here, which is for arrears, may be only a part payment (cf. *ἀπὸ λόγου*, 7?). (3) The amount may have been lower in 361 than in the fifth century. (4) Payments connected with Pelusium may have been extra to and separate from ‘general’ charges for transport in flat-bottomed boats.

7 The fourth indiction refers to the year before, 360/1 (before 1 May 361; see R. S. Bagnall and K. A. Worp, *Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt* 26). The numbered indiction references in **4598–4600** and probably **4604** refer to the current fifth indiction (361/2, from 1 May 361 at Oxyrhynchus).

R. A. COLES

#### 4606–4613. DOCUMENTS CONCERNING THE *ANNONA*

The texts in the following group are not physically linked as were **4598–4605** (except **4611–12**), and unlike **4598–4605** they all concern different transactions, but except for **4607** they all relate to an earlier stage of the same process, the collection and delivery to Pelusium and Alexandria of various *annona* commodities. The first of this new group, **4606**,

is dated to August–September 361 and must therefore have been addressed to the Oxyrhynchite strategus Septimius Apollonius who features in **4598–4605**, but **4606**'s content is closer to the later group. **4607–13** all fit in the date span 362–4; a further link between them is that they are all addressed to C. Julius Leucadius, strategus of the Oxyrhynchite, probably Septimius Apollonius' immediate successor and currently the last strategus of the Oxyrhynchite to be known by name. Cf. **4598–4605** introd. His name should be added to G. Bastianini and J. Whitehorne, *Strategi and Royal Scribes* 106. He had already been prytanis of Oxyrhynchus by 360, see P. Mert. I 36.

The general format of **4606** and **4608–13** is clearest in **4612** (the most fully preserved) but the following is applicable also to the others. Before conjunction in a *τόμος συγκολλησίμος* (as **4611** was attached to **4612**), each item comprised (*a*) the report, headed by the consular date and finishing with the (sometimes inset) specification of the boat being used, this latter part possibly inserted and written in a large formal hand, and with subscriptions (usually two) at the foot, and (*b*), preserved in **4611–12**, on continuous surface to the right (i.e. not separated by a *συγκολλησίμος*-type join) and in a different practised official cursive, the list of the commodities to be delivered, which closes with a consular reprise, month and day. On the back, regardless of whether it was the back of (*a*) or (*b*), was placed a brief annotation of the indiction, commodity and quantity.

Many of the Oxyrhynchite councillors, functioning as *ἐπιμεληταί* and undertaking the deliveries, appear in more than one text in the group. In several of the texts it seems that they may have functioned as a college of five. For convenience a table is given overleaf. The most often attested, Sarapion son of Plutarchus, may recur in SB XIV 12099 of 367.

Identification of the hands in these texts is a problem. Part of the difficulty is whether the boat sections are really in a different hand, or just in a different style by the same writer. A further difficulty is whether any more weight can be placed on occasional stylistic similarities between the main script of **4608** and **4611** col. i on the one hand, and the main scripts of **4612** and **4613** on the other.

#### 4606. UNDERTAKING TO DELIVER WHEAT TO PELUSIUM

119/11

14.5 × 26.5 cm

August–September 361

Chronologically this text falls within the time span of the preceding group **4598–4605**, and it relates to Pelusium as do those texts, but its format is akin to **4608–13** in the Leucadius group that follows.

A group of four(?) Oxyrhynchite councillors, functioning as *ἐπιμεληταὶ κύτου Πηλουσίου*, declares on oath to the strategus that they have taken charge of 800 artabas of wheat and loaded them on board a boat (of which the specifications are given in 16–18) and will deliver it to Pelusium. The first-named of the group and his father are potentially of prosopographical interest, see 16 n.

There is a manufacturer's three-layer kollesis down the left edge. On the back are the



badly abraded remains of a two(?)-line docket; the lines are quite long compared with the others of this group.  $\pi\lambda\eta\rho$  is reasonably clear in the middle of the first line, but there is not another letter that I can identify.

- [ὕπατείας Φλαουίων Ταύρου καὶ Φλωρ]εῦτιοῦ τῶν λαμ(προτάτων),  
 Θὼθ . . .  
 [Cεπτιμίω Ἀπολλωνίω ] στρατηγῶ [Ὁξυρυγχίτου]  
 [παρὰ Ἀνρηλίων Διοσκούριδου τοῦ καί(?)] Ἰφ[υλι]ανοῦ Ἰουλιανοῦ <τοῦ  
 καὶ> Διοσκούριδου καὶ Ἰου[λιανοῦ(?]  
 [ c. 29 ] . . . κ[α]ῖ! Cαραπίωνος Πλουτάρχου τῶν  
 πάντ[ων βουλευτῶν]  
 5 [τῆς λαμ(πράς) καὶ λαμ(προτάτης)(?) Ὁξυρυγχι]τῶν πόλεως ἐπιμελητῶν  
 cíτου Πηλουσίου. [ὁμολογοῦμεν]  
 [ὀμνύντες τὸν σεβάσμιον θεῖον ὄρκο]ν τ[ῶ]ν δεξποτῶν ἡμῶν Κωνσταντίου  
 αἰωνίου Αὐγ[ούστου καὶ]  
 [Ἰουλιανοῦ τοῦ ἐπιφανεστάτου Καίς]αρος παρὶληφέναι καὶ ἐμβεβληῆσθαι  
 εἰς τὸ ἐξῆς [ὑποτεταγμένον]  
 [πλοῖον ἀπὸ γενήματος τῆς εὐ]τυ[χοῦς] εἰς// βέας ἰνδικτίονος πυροῦ  
 νέου καθαροῦ ἀκρίθου καὶ ἀβρόχου]  
 [καὶ ἐκτὸς πάσης αἰτίας καθεστηκότος μέτρ]ω δημοσίῳ μετρήσι τῇ  
 κελευ[ς]θίσει ἐπ[ὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἀρτάβας ὀκτακοσίας]  
 10 [ c. 27 ] . . κενωθεσίαν ε . . [ . ] . . ου μέρος  
 κεκοσκ(ινευμένον) . . . [  
 [ c. 27 ] . . . καθὼς ὁ ζυγοστάτης ὑπέβαλεν ἰδι . . [  
 [ c. 25 κα]τενεγκῶμεν ἐπὶ τῇ λαμ(προτάτη)  
 Πηλουσιωτῶν [μητροπόλει  
 [ c. 29 ] . . . θησαυρ[ ] . . . [ . . . ] ἀριθμῶ π[λήρης]  
 [ c. 29 ] . . . εἰς τὸ ἐν μηδενὶ μεμφθῆναι ἢ ἐν[οχοι  
 εἶημεν τῶ]  
 15 [θείω ὄρκω up to c. 20 ] . (vac.) [  
 [εἰς πλοῖον ἰδιωτικὸν c. 6 β]εγεφικιαρίου [τά]ξεως τ[ο]ῦ λαμ(προτάτου)  
 δουκὸς . . [  
 [ c. 16 ἀπὸ τοῦ Ὁξυ]ρ[υ]γχίτου αἰ [π(ροκείμεναι)] τ[ο]ῦ[υ] c[ί]τ[ο]υ  
 ἀ(ρτάβαι) ὡ', οἷ ἐ[γ](γυνητής) [  
 [ c. 28 ] . . . [ . . . ] . . . (vac.?)  
 (m. 2) [Ἀνρήλιος Cαραπίων Π]λουτάρχ[ου] παρίληφ(α) τὰς τοῦ cíτου

ἀρτάβας ὠκτακοσίας [

20 (m. 3) [Αὐρήλιος c. 8 c]ψ[μπ]αρίληφα ἄμα τοῖς κοῖ(νωνοῖς) καὶ  
cυνπαραδῶ[cω

1 λαμς//?      7 l. παρειληφέναι      9 l. μετρήσει, κελευσθείςη      10 κεκοκς?  
λαμς      16 λαμς//      17 αϞ?      εγ''      19 l. παρείληφα, ὀκτακοσίας      20 l. cυμπαρείληφα  
κοῖ?      καί corr.?      l. cυμπαραδώσω

'In the consulship of Flavii Taurus and Florentius, *viri clarissimi*, Thoth x.

'To Septimius Apollonius, strategus of the Oxyrhynchite, [from Aurelii Dioscurides alias?] Julianus son of Julianus (alias) Dioscurides and Julianus(?) . . . and Sarapion son of Plutarchus, all councillors [of the illustrious and most illustrious?] city of the Oxyrhynchites, overseers of wheat for Pelusium. We acknowledge, swearing the august divine oath by our masters Constantius eternal Augustus and Julianus the most noble Caesar, that we have received and loaded on to the boat specified hereafter, from the produce of the propitious 5th new indiction, a total of eight hundred artabas of wheat that is new, pure, free from barley and dry and clear of all blame, ascertained by public measure according to the ordained method of measurement . . . we will convey (the cargo) down to the illustrious metropolis of the Pelusioti . . . granary . . . to the full amount . . . so as to be blamed in nothing, or may we be liable to the consequences of the divine oath.

'On to a private boat belonging to . . . , *beneficiarius* in the *officium* of the *dux, vir clarissimus*, . . . from the Oxyrhynchite, the aforesaid 800 artabas of wheat: of which the guarantor . . .'

(2nd hand) 'I, Aurelius Sarapion son of Plutarchus, have received the eight hundred artabas of wheat . . .'

(3rd hand) 'I, Aurelius . . . , have received (the artabas of wheat) jointly with my colleagues and I will jointly hand (them) over . . .'

<sup>1</sup> The date and the restoration of the consuls' names here mainly depend on the reference to Constantius II in 6 (deceased 3 November 361 near Tarsus) and to the newly-begun 5th indiction in 8.

The day of the month (Thoth) at the line end may not have two digits (restricting the day to September), but might have a single figure with a marker-stroke.

<sup>2</sup> For the identity of the strategus cf. **4598** and **4602** above. **4606**'s date falls between the dates of those two.

<sup>3</sup> Ἰο[υλι]ανοῦ Ἰουλιανοῦ Διοσκουρίδου. Some correction is necessary. Bracketing one Ἰουλιανοῦ for deletion, or inserting καί before the second Ἰουλιανοῦ, would have the same effect of identifying one of the ἐπιμεληταί as Julianus son of Dioscurides, undoubtedly the distinguished but now elderly local figure: see further 16 n. This Julianus was Flavius, not Aurelius. I have thought it preferable to supply (τοῦ καὶ) between Ἰουλιανοῦ and Διοσκουρίδου, with the effect of making this Julianus (with a new but not unexpected alias) the father of the Julianus named just before. Knowledge of this family's history and nomenclature (cf. P. Oxy. LIV pp. 223–6) then strongly suggests the supplement Διοσκουρίδου τοῦ καὶ in the first part of the line.

<sup>8</sup> πνροῦ. This text uses εἶπου in 5, 17 and 19.

<sup>10</sup> κενωθεσίαν. The word appears to be new. The spelling is uncertain: \*κενοθεσία? \*κανοθεσία?

ἐπι? After that, the remaining letters could equally admit [ἀ]γγούμερος, cf. **4612** 13. Then, δογκός would be tempting, cf. **4612** 14, but the letter before κ does appear to be ε, with γ excluded.

11 ζυγοστάτης. See LXIII 4395 26–7 n. 4606 appears to be the earliest reference to the office in a papyrus.

12 For the future form κατενεγκοῦμεν (κα]τενεγκωμεν pap.) see Gignac, *Grammar* ii. 287–8.

ἐπὶ τῆ. Case usage in this expression appears to be rather free; we find the genitive in 4598, 4602, and 4612, the accusative in 4608 and 4609.

For the epithet λαμπροτάτη applied to Pelusium cf. 4602 6 and 4604 3 above.

13 Cf. 4610 11, though the wording must have been slightly different here.

15 A few faint marks at the end of the line may indicate that ἔστι δέ once stood there. Cf. 4612 12 n.

16 πλοῖον) as elsewhere (4609, 4613) would admit a longer personal name for the *beneficiarius*. On boat owners see R. S. Bagnall, *Egypt in Late Antiquity* 36–7.

There is, I suppose, no reason to think that the *beneficiarius* here might be Flavius Julianus, the well-attested former *curator civitatis* of the Oxyrhynchite who features in 4610 4 below as father of Aurelius ?Gennadius, councillor and ἐπιμελητής, and probably here in 3 with his previously unattested alias Dioscurides, perhaps as father of Dioscurides alias Julianus—likewise councillor (restored) and ἐπιμελητής—whom we might suppose to be his elder son, this pair of names then being attested over four generations, the order of the names being reversed each generation. Julianus was still active in 355, see LX 4092, and may have held a post in the office of the *praeses* of Augustamnica in 360, see 4092 introd., possibly *beneficiarius*, see P. Oxy. LIV p. 226. Here the *beneficiarius* is attached to the office of the *dux*. The name Ἰουλιανοῦ could fit, if πλοῖον were abbreviated (see above), but we would lack the *gentilicium* Flavius for him; on the other hand, the boat-owner Theon in 4612 is a person we might also expect to have the *gentilicium* Flavius, certainly not present. It might seem only natural for Dioscurides alias Julianus to make use of his father's boat for the shipment, even though his brother ?Gennadius did not do so two years later (4610).

The reading at the end is uncertain. 4612 at this point continues (as restored) along the lines οὐ κυβερνήτης X son of Y ἀπὸ Z. οὐδ' is not easily read here.

R. A. COLES

#### 4607. RECEIPTS OF ΑΝΝΟΜΑ COMMODITIES

119/17

32 × 19.5 cm

362/3

Aurelius Sarapion, ἐπιμελητής ἀννωνῶν and probably an Oxyrhynchite councillor, reports to C. Julius Leucadius, strategus of the Oxyrhynchite (see 4606–13 introd.), the receipt of substantial quantities of wine and meat and their disbursement to soldiers of a unit under -nianus, *praepositus*. The amounts involved were: wine, 30,000 *xestai*, approximately 15,000 litres (col. i 10), and 15,000 *litrai* of meat, approximately 5000 kg (col. i 11). Ration figures show many variables but these amounts might represent a month's supplies for 1000 men: see P. Oxy. LX p. 192. The short 9-line statement of report was followed by a long itemised list of the commodities, arranged by municipal and villagers' contributions, the former under individual names. It is not stated from whom Aurelius Sarapion obtained these supplies; I suspect that 4607 does not represent the record of the original collection from the locals (cf. LXI 4119 introd. ad fin.) and that the long list following was simply copied here from an earlier document.

The municipal wine contributions occupy the lower half of col. i, then all of cols. ii–iii, and probably continued into a lost col. iv; these would then have been followed by the villagers' contributions of wine, roughly twice the quantity but probably summarised by village instead of under individual names, and then the meat contributions from the

two sources must have followed that, so that the report would have run to several columns beyond what survives. To some extent LX 4089 is parallel.

On the back (on the other side of the top of col. ii), and perhaps in the same hand, is a five-line annotation summarizing the quantities of wine (line 1), meat (2), and further *litrai* amounts in 3 and possibly 4–5, that in 5 possibly the total of 3–4. Whether these further *litrai* amounts represent another commodity or commodities is unclear. Lines 10–11 of col. i on the front offer no scope for more than two commodities.

There is a manufacturer's three-layer kollesis between cols. i and ii.

## Col. i

[Γ]αίου Ἰουλίου Λευ[κ]αδίου στρατηγῶ Ὀξυρ[υγχιτο]υ  
 [πα]ρὰ Ἀ[ύ]ρηλίου Καραπίωνος Ἑρμ . . . . . [ . . . ] . .  
 [ ?πόλε]ως ἐπιμελ(ητοῦ) ἀννωνῶν στρατιωτ[ικῶ]υ  
 [3–4]υ . . [ . ]υιανον πραιπόσιτον α . . . [ c. 7 ]  
 5 [2–3] τῆν εἰρήνη[υ. λό]γος τῆς γενομένης ὑ[π' ἐμο]ῦ  
 παραλήμψεως οἴνου καὶ κρέ[ω]ς καὶ π[α]ρ[α]δόσεω[ς]  
 [τ]οῖς αὐτοῖς στρατιώτης γενήματος 5'' ἰνδικτίου[ος τὸ]  
 [κατ' ἀν]δρα ἐξῆς ἐντάξας ἐπιδίδομι τῆ cῆ ἐμμελεία  
 [ἴν' εἰδέ]υ[α]ι ἔχοις. ἔστι δέ .  
 10 [οἴνου ὑποστάε]ω[ς] ξ(εστῶν) (μυριάδες) γ  
 [κρέω[ς] ὑπο]ς[τ]άεω[ς] λί(τραί) (μυρ.) α ,E  
 ὧν  
 [ c. 8 ]ου πολιτῶν τον[ ] [ ] (vac.)  
 [ c. 8 ]π[ε] [ c. 6 ] . . ξ(έεται) ,Θτγ'  
 15 [ c. 8 ] . . [ ](vac.)[ ]υ'

## Col. ii

Θεωνίς Εὐτολμίου [ ]  
 Φλ(άουιος) Ἀλέξανδρος νοτάριος ξ(έεται) φ''  
 Εὐάντιον Ἀφθονίου ξ(έεται) τ'  
 Ὑπηρέχιον Λεωνίδου ξ(έεται) ]η'  
 5 Ἀρσινόη γυ(νή) . . . . . ρ[ . . ] ξ(έεται) κ'  
 Ἡλιοδώρα θυ(γάτηρ) Ἀπολλωνίου[υ] ξ(έεται) ρ'  
 Κυράδιον θυ(γάτηρ) Ἀγαθίνο[υ] ξ(έεται) ρ  
 [ . . ] . [ . ] υ( ) Ἀμμων[ια]νο[ύ] ξ(έεται) ιγ  
 [ᾠ]ρίων γραμ(ματεὺς) δ'' πάγο[υ] ξ(έεται) ι



10	Θεόδουλος Ἀπολλωνίου	ξ(έσται) λγ
	Οὐαλεντῖνα γυ(νή) Δυναμίου	ξ(έσται) χ
	Ζερῆνος . . . . [ . ] . υ	ξ(έσται) εν
	Διονύσιος ὀφ(φικιάλιος)	ξ(έσται) φ
	. [ . . . ] . ρεῖος Ἀριςτίωνος	ξ(έσται) .
15	[ . . . . ] ωνιος χειρόμενος φύλαξ	[ . . . . ]
	[ . . . . ] . τ . . . καὶ Σαραποδώρα	ξ(έσται) . .
	[ 6-7 ] θυ(γάτηρ) Ὠριγέν[ους]	ξ(έσται) ξ'
	[ . . . . c. 18 . . . . ] .	ξ(έσται) τ
	[ . . . . up to c. 19 . . . . ]	ξ(έσται) c
20	[ . . . . c. 18 . . . . ] . . . . . [ . . . . ]	

## Col. iii

	. . . [ . ] ις γυ(νή) Γαιανοῦ	ξ(έσται) . [ . . . ]
	Ἀπίων Ἀπολιναρίου	ξ(έσται) [ . . . ]
	Γερόντιος Ποδοιδωνίου	[ . . . ]
	Φλ(άουιος) Εὐδαίμων ὀφ(φικιάλιος)	ξ(έσται) [ . . . ]
5	Πτολεμ[α]ί[ος] Εὐλόγιου	ξ(έσται) [ . . . ]
	Φλ(άουιος) Κρησκέντιος	ξ(έσται) [ . . . ]
	Μακρόβιος Ζώιλου	[ . . . ]
	Ἀπίων Καρ[α]π[ί]ωνος	[ . . . ]
	Ἑρμίας ἀπὸ πραι(ποσίτων)	[ . . . ]
10	Φλ(άουιος) . . [ . ] βάτιος	[ . . . ]
	Φλ(άουιος) Ζήνων ἀπὸ πραι(ποσίτων)	[ . . . ]
	Σαραπιάς γυ(νή) Ἀντιόχο[υ]	
	. . [ . ] . . . [ . . . ] . . . [ . . . ]	
	Διονυσό[δ]ωρος Δο . [ . . . ]	
15	. . ρασιον [ γυ(νή)? ] Θεοδώ[ρου](?)	
	Τιμόθεο[ς] ὀφ(φικιάλιος) [ . . . ]	
	Θε[ . . . ] . . . . c φ . . . . [ . . . ]	
	. . [ . . ] . . . . [ . . ] υ ( ) . . . . ε . [ . . . ]	
	Εὐτρόπιον θυ(γάτηρ) . . . [ . . . ]	
20	Γε[ . . ] . [ . . . ]	
	. [ . . . ]	

Back, ↓

1 οἴ(νον) ξ(έστα) (μυριάδε) γ . . . ια . . . υς  
 2 κρέ(ωσ) λί(τραι) (μυριάς) α [[<sup>E</sup>B. . .]]  
 3 λί(τραι) [[<sup>Zρπβ'</sup>Εωνβ]]  
 4 [ up to c. 5 ] . . . λ ρι  
 5 ] . τ ρ λ . . [ . ] . [

Col. i

1 γαῖον 1. Γαίω Ἰουλίω Λευκαδίω 3 ἐπιμελ 5 1. λόγον 7 1. στρατιώταις 8 1. ἐπιδίδωμι  
 9 Unexplained diagonal stroke over ε of ἔχοις δέ? 10 ξ; so in 13, and col. ii 2–14, 16–19, col. iii 1–2, 3–5  
 and Back 1 ∪ (so in 11, and Back 1–2) 11 λ (so Back 2–3, also ?4–5) . Λε

Col. ii

2 φλ (so col. iii 4, 6, 10–11) 3 1. Εἰάνθιον? 4 ὑπηρεχίον; 1. Ὑπερέχιον 5 γυ<sup>-</sup> (so in 11,  
 col. iii 1, 12) 6 θυ<sup>-</sup> (so in 7, 17 and col. iii 19) 8 [γ]υ<sup>-</sup> or [θ]υ<sup>-</sup> 9 γραμς 13 οφ;  
 so in col. iii 4

Col. iii

1 -ῖανου 7 ζωῖλου 9 πραι? (so in 11) 16 οφ? Only diagonal survives 18 γ]  
 υ<sup>-</sup> or θ]υ<sup>-</sup>

Back

1 οι<sup>+</sup> 2 κρε? supralinear Λε (so in deletion in 3)

Col. i

‘To Gaius Julius Leucadius, strategus of the Oxyrhynchite, from Aurelius Sarapion son of Herm-, [councillor of the same city?], overseer of army supplies . . . -nianus, *praepositus* . . . I submit to Your Grace the account of the collection of wine and meat effected by me and its disbursement to the aforesaid soldiers from the produce of the 6th indiction, attaching herewith the list by individuals, that you may be able to know. As follows:

‘Wine, assessed on property	30,000 xestai.
Meat, assessed on property	15,000 lbs.
‘Of which:	
‘ . . . metropolitans . . .	9,350 xestai

Col. ii

‘Theonis . . . of Eutolmius [	
‘Flavius Alexander, notary	500 xestai
‘Evantion . . . of Aphthonius	300 xestai
‘Hyperechion . . . of Leonides	[ ]8 xestai
‘Arsinoe wife of . . .	20 xestai
‘Heliodora daughter of Apollonius	100 xestai

'Syradion daughter of Agathinus	100 xestai
'-on wife/daughter of Ammonianus	13 xestai
'Horion, secretary of the 4th pagus	10 xestai
'Theodulus son of Apollonius	33 xestai
'Valentina wife of Dynamius	600 xestai
'Serenus . . .	250 xestai
'Dionysius, <i>officialis</i>	500 xestai
'-rius son of Aristion	[ ] xestai
'-onius, former guard	[ ]
' . . . and Sarapodora	[ ] xestai
'[ ] daughter of Horigenes	60 xestai
'[ ]	300 xestai
'[ ]	200 xestai
'[ ] . . . . . [ ]	

Col. iii

'-is wife of [?G]aianus	[ ] xestai
'Apion son of Apolinarius	[ ] xestai
'Gerontius son of Posidonius	[ ]
'Flavius Eudaemon, <i>officialis</i>	[ ] xestai
'Ptolemaeus son of Eulogius	[ ] xestai
'Flavius Crescentius	[ ] xestai
'Macrobius son of Zoilus	[ ]
'Apion son of Sarapion	[ ]
'Hermias, former <i>praepositus</i>	[ ]
'Flavius -batus	[ ]
'Flavius Zenon, former <i>praepositus</i>	[ ]
'Sarapias wife of Antiochus [ ]	[ ]
(traces)	
'Dionysodorus . . . [ ]	[ ]
'-rason [wife/daughter?] of Theodorus [ ]	[ ]
'Timotheus, <i>officialis</i> (?)	[ ]
'The- . . . [ ]	[ ]
(damaged)	
'Eutropion daughter of . . . [ ]	[ ]
'Ge- [ ]	[ ]
(trace) [ ]	

(Back)

- 'Wine: 30,000 xestai . . .  
 'Meat: 15,000 lbs.' (corr. from 12,000+)  
 '7182 lbs.' (corr. from 5852)

‘ . . . 110(?) lbs.(?)  
 ‘Total(?) . . . lbs.(?)’

## Col. i

2 After Sarapion’s father’s name, the line may have run *βουλευτοῦ τῆς ἀδτῆς* (probably abbreviated); cf. LX **4089** 3, but this cannot be verified from the scanty traces.

3 For *ἀννωνῶν στρατιωτικῶν* cf. SB VI 9597.3.

3–4 Restoration here is difficult. We expect *τοῖς ὑπὸ* preceding the name of the commanding officer, the end of whose name is clear. A dubious possibility would be to read *στρατιωτῆ[κῶν τῶ]ν* at the end of 3, [*ὑπὸ*] at the start of 4. This is forcing the space at the end of 3, but *στρατιωτῆ[κ(ῶν) τῶ]ν* would avoid that difficulty.

7 The 6th indiction = AD 362/3.

8 *τῆς ἐγὲ ἐμμελείας*. Cf. LX **4089**, and **4602**.

10–11 For *ὑποστάσεως* cf. **4599** 2 n.

11 Contrast the way of indicating thousands here (and in 14) with that in the annotation on the back.

14 Deducting this figure of 9,350 *xestai*, being the contributions from [or collected by, in the case of official-looking entries in col. iii, cf. **4089**?] municipal landholders, from the total (30,000 *xestai*) in 10 leaves 20,650 *xestai* as the villagers’ contributions.

14 ]πξ[. Or ]τξ[.

## Col. ii

There are at least ten entries with women in this column. (**4089** ii has 3 women in 10 entries.) On women as landowners see J. Rowlandson, *Landowners and Tenants*, esp. 284.

1, 3–4 Elsewhere the women are specified as wife/daughter. It seems less likely that they were slaves acting on behalf of their masters.

9 Horion, secretary of the 4th pagus, recurs in PSI V 451. LX **4091** attests a secretary of the 1st pagus in 352.

13 It seems surprising that Dionysius is not qualified as Flavius. Cf. col. iii 9, 16.

16 [*Ἡροδ*] *ῥτη ἡ καὶ Ἐαραποδώρα* is no more than a guess but could be a possible reading, suggesting a connection with LXIII **4368** 4 where the same names may be linked by *ἡς* for *ἡ* (*καὶ*), see note ad loc. If so, then the date for **4368** may be rather later than that proposed (‘c. 325–350?’).

20 An amount of *xestai* to the right? Last trace τ? I am unsure which trace is the ζ.

The legible total is 3044 *xestai*, including 50 recognizable in col. i 15. At an average c. 200 per entry, the missing figures in col. ii might add 1000 or so, making the list in cols. i+ii total c. 4000, roughly half the municipal contributions; thus col. iii (where the quantities have all been lost) would nearly complete the list of municipal wine contributions. Note that the Flavius-entries in col. iii may represent larger contributions as in **4089** (33; see introd.).

## Col. iii

At least five women in this column.

6–7 For Crescentius and Macrobius see LX **4089** 33 and n. (AD 352). Flavius Crescentius was a former *praepositus* (PSI I 90); Macrobius, his father Zoilus’ name new information, had held a post in the *praeses*’ office, and neither **4089** nor **4607** call him Flavius. For other Macrobian in the later fourth century see LXVI **4529** 3 n.

9 Cf. col. ii 13; again, the omission of Flavius is surprising, and likewise in col. iii 16, if rightly interpreted.

15 The first name might be *Κοράκιον*. In the lacuna, *θυγάτηρ* is equally possible.

## Back

The docket offers a number of reading difficulties, notably the end of line 1. In 4 *λ(τραί)* is very uncertain, and transcribed π following could be φ. Also in 5 *λ(τραί)* is very uncertain, and could be Δ. Before it, I suspect that the intention might be *ἐπὶ τὸ ἀδτό*, but I cannot verify it.

## 4608. UNDERTAKING TO DELIVER BARLEY TO ALEXANDRIA

119/27(b)

11.5 × 24 cm

362 (after 1 May)

A declaration to C. Julius Leucadius, strategus of the Oxyrhynchite (cf. the contemporary **4607** and the introd. to **4606–13** above) by a group of five(?) Oxyrhynchite councilors(?) functioning as *ἐπιμεληταὶ κριθῆς* that they have received 701 artabas of barley and loaded them on board a boat for delivery to Alexandria. Details of the boat are given in 12–14, in a large and different script (but different hand?) and possibly inserted into a space left blank; much the same applies to the rest of the texts of this group. In the present instance the large script is so faded as to give an initial impression of a deep blank space between lines 11 and 15.

On the back is a three-line docket giving the figure of 701 artabas (barley not stated here; cf. **4609**), and then dividing it into municipal contributions (1 artaba) and villagers' contributions (700 artabas). **4609**'s contributions have a broadly similar ratio.

The date is 362 (consular formula, line 1), but after 1 May 362 because of the reference to the 6th indiction (= 362/3), line 7, and after that summer's harvest because the barley to be transported is produce from it.

This and the rest of the group **4609–13** all relate to transport to Alexandria, as far as can be determined; at any rate, there are no further references to Pelusium (**4598–4606**). For a possible chronological/dynastic explanation of this, see **4598–4605** introd.

The contorted hand of lines 1–11 is reminiscent of that of LIV **3746** (AD 319) and LXIV **4441** cols. ix–x (AD 315), and I do not discount the possibility of the same scribe being at work, in spite of the enormous interval. Since I think that **4611** (AD 363) col. i is the work of this scribe, this would result in a working life of not less than 49 years.

There is a manufacturer's three-layer kollesis after *Φλαουίου* in 1. 1.5 cm of vertical fibres (the back of the upper sheet) have, I think, been omitted in manufacture, not stripped after making the sheet, as is shown by the way a horizontal strip has folded over at line 2: the papyrus must have been wet for that to happen, the phenomenon being much less likely if vertical fibres were stripped from the finished sheet. Cf. **4611**.

[ὑπατείας Κλαυδίου]υ Μαμερτίνου καὶ Φλαουίου Νεβιέτ[τ]α [τῶν  
λαμπροτάτων.]

[Γαίω Ἰουλί]ω Λευκαδίῳ στρατηγῶ [Ἰοξυρυγίτου]

[παρὰ Ἀὐρηλίω]ν Πέτρον Ἀγαθίνου καὶ Ἀμμωνίου Ἀπίωνος [καὶ x son  
of x]

[καὶ Σαραπίω]νος Πλουτάρχου καὶ Δωροθέου Ἀρσιόου τῶν [πάντων  
βουλευτῶν τῆς Ἰοξυρυγίτων πόλεως]

5 [ἐπιμελητῶν κρι]θῆς Ἀλεξανδρίας. ὁμολογοῦμεν ὅ[μνύντες τὸν σεβάσμιον  
θεῖον ὄρκον τοῦ]

- [δεσπότου ἡμῶν Ἰο]υλια[ν]οῦ αἰωνίου Ἀυγούστου παριληφέν[αι καὶ  
 ἐμβεβλήσθαι εἰς τὸ ὑπο-]  
 [τεταγμένον πλοῖον ἀπὸ] γενήματος τῆς 55' ἰνδικτ[ίον]ος κρ[ιθῆ]ς [νέας  
 καθαρὰς ἀδόλου καὶ]  
 [ἀβρόχου καὶ ἐκτὸς πάσης] αἰτίας κατεσκευυίας μέτρο δημος[ίω  
 μετρήσει τῇ κελευσθείσῃ]  
 [ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ (ἀρτάβας) ψα, τὸν δὲ γόμο]ν κατενυκοῦμεν ἐπὶ τὴν  
 λαμ[προτάτην] Ἀλεξ[ανδρ-]  
 10 [ c. 20 ] καὶ τῆς παραδόσεως ἄποχα γράμ[ματα]  
 [ἐπενεγκεῖν εἰς τὸ ἐν μηδενὶ μεμφθῆναι]  
 [ἢ ἔνοχοι εἴημεν τῷ θε]ίῳ ὄρκῳ.
- (m. 2) [εἰς πολῖ]ον ἰδιωτικὸν . . . . . [ . . . . . ]  
 [ γ. [.] . . . . κυβεβ(νήτου) τοῦ αὐτοῦ . . . . [ . . . . . ]  
 [ αἱ π(ροκείμεναι) τῆς κρ]ιθ(ῆς) (ἀρτάβαι) ψα οὐ ἐγ(υνητη)ς  
 . . . . . [ . . . . . ]
- 15 (m. 3) [Ἀυρήλιο]ς Σαραπίων Πλουτάρχου συν[παρείληφα  
 [ c. 9 ] ἑπτακοσίας μίαν καὶ [

Back ↓

- 1 (m. 4) (ἀρτάβαι) ψα  
 2 ὦν πολ(ιτών) (ἀρτάβη) α  
 3 κωμ(ητών) (ἀρτάβαι) ψ

5 l. Ἀλεξανδρείας 6 l. παρειληφέναι 8 l. καθεστηκυίας μέτρο 9 l. κατενυκοῦμεν λαμ  
 10 l. παράδοσεως γραμ 13 κυβεβ 14 κριθῆ form of abbreviation of ἐγ( ) unclear 15 l.  
 συμπαρείληφα

Back:

- 1 2 πολ 3 κωμ??

‘In the consulship of Claudius Mamertinus and Flavius Nevitta, *viri clarissimi*.

‘To Gaius Julius Leucadius, strategus of the Oxyrhynchite, from Aurelii Petrus son of Agathinus and Ammonius son of Apion [and *x* son of *x* and] Sarapion son of Plutarchus and Dorotheus son of Arsinoüs, all councillors of the city of the Oxyrhynchites, overseers of barley for Alexandria. We acknowledge, swearing the august divine oath by our master Julianus, eternal Augustus, that we have received and loaded on to the boat specified hereunder, from the produce of the 6th indiction, a total of 701 artabas of barley that is new, pure, free from guile and dry and clear of all blame, ascertained by public measure accord-

ing to the ordained method of measurement, and we will convey the cargo down to the most illustrious [?metropolis of] the Alexandrians . . . and that we will bring back receipts for the transfer so as to be blamed in nothing, or may we be liable to the consequences of the divine oath.’

(2nd hand) ‘On to a private boat . . . the steersman being the same . . . the aforesaid 701 artabas of barley: of which the guarantor . . .’

(3rd hand) ‘I, Aurelius Sarapion son of Plutarchus, have received jointly . . . seven hundred and one and . . .’

(Back) (4th hand) ‘701 artabas: of which, from metropolitans, 1 artaba; from villagers, 700 artabas.’

3 A Petrus, son of Agathinus, is attested in LXIII **4371** (c. 350).

3–4 The *ἐπιμεληταί* who appear in these texts **4606–13** are mostly attested more than once during the period 361–4, and seemingly indiscriminately with reference to wheat or barley. See the table in the introd. above to this group.

7 The 6th indiction = AD 362/3.

ἰνδικτ[ίον]ος. Only faint traces; the printed text is restoration rather than reading. The text might have run *νέας ἰνδικτίονος*, cf. **4606** 8 and **4609** 7.

9 *ἐπὶ τὴν λαμ(προτάτην) Ἀλεξ[άνδρειαν?]* Cf. e.g. XXXII **2347** 8, XXIII **2673** 24, P. Mich. XV 724.10, P. Vind. Sijp. 1.i.14. **4609** 9 has just *ἐπὶ τὴν λαμ(προτάτην) Ἀλεξ[α]* much as here. Or the longer form *ἐπὶ τὴν λαμ(προτάτην) Ἀλεξ[ανδρέων μητρόπολιν]*; cf. **4612** 9–10 where *ἐπὶ* is followed by the genitive. Note **4606** 12 n.

10 For *τῆς παραδόσεως ἄποχα γράμματα* cf. XXXVI **2766** 19, and also **4597** 21. These *γράμματα* are exemplified by **4600–1** and **4603–5** above.

14 The first part of this line is hardly visible and only a little more visible with powerful image-enhancing equipment. I have transcribed what is expected, which is at least not contradicted by the traces.

15 The subscription is in the same hand I think as **4606** 19 and **4612** 17, but oddly different from that of Sarapion in **4613** 16 — perhaps another Sarapion in that text, lost at the end of line 3 (although contrast **4613** 4 n.)?

R. A. COLES

#### 4609. UNDERTAKING TO DELIVER WHEAT TO ALEXANDRIA

119/32(a)

11.5 × 26.5 cm

362 (after 1 May)

This is a fragmentary parallel to **4608**, only the line-beginnings surviving here, although the lines were clearly of considerable length as the attested wording indicates. Three (at least) of the *ἐπιμεληταί* who feature here featured in **4608**; here they undertake to deliver wheat, not barley. The date must be much the same, on precisely the same criteria, see **4608** introd. The indiction is described as ‘new’, line 7 (it might have been so described in **4608** also; see 7 n. there). For this expression see R. S. Bagnall and K. A. Worp, *Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt* 30–5. *νέας* occurs also in **4606** and **4612**, and these texts provide solid evidence unavailable to Bagnall and Worp of the use of ‘new’ in connection with the indiction which has begun (contrast *ibid.* 34 top, but see now Worp in P. Kell. G. 30.1–2 n.). **4606** dates to Thoth, **4612** to Mesore. For **4608–9** all we can say is

that the date must be at least after 1 May and after the harvest; how late the presence of *νέα* will allow them to be, remains unclear.

The format is that familiar from the rest of the group, with details of the boat (12–14) written large but not necessarily by a different hand.

On the back is a 5-line docket, which gives the number of artabas involved (over 3000, not specified as wheat), which sum is then split according to municipal contributions (19, + fractions) and villagers' contributions (over 3000, a broadly similar ratio to **4608**), plus a third amount (67<sup>1/2</sup>) under the heading *ταμ(ιακῶν?)* (sc. *ἀνδρῶν*, cf. P. Turner 44.6 and n.; *ταμιακοὶ γεωργοί*, SB XVI 12814.9), cf. LX **4089** 24 and 53 and see also XLVI **3307** 14. This docket is in the same hand as that on the back of **4608**, and perhaps the dockets on the backs of **4611** and **4613** as well.

The preceding item in the *τόμος* has vanished, but perhaps left traces of its join to **4609** on the latter's surface.

ὑπατείας Κλαυδίου Μαρμερτ[ίνου καὶ Φλαουίου Νεβιέττα τῶν  
λαμπροτάτων.]  
 Γαίῳ Ἰ[ο]υλίῳ Λε[υκαδίου στρατηγῶ Ὁξυρυγίτου]  
 παρὰ Ἀύρηλιῶν Πέτρου Ἀγαθ[ίνου καὶ x son of x καὶ x son of x  
Cαραπίω-]  
 νος Πλουτάρχου καὶ Δωροθ[έου Ἀρσινόου τῶν πάντων βουλευτῶν τῆς  
Ὁξυρυγικῶν πόλεως ἐπιμελητῶν]  
 5 *τίτου Ἀλεξανδρίας. ὄμ[ο]λ[ογούμην]* ]  
*αἰωνίου Ἀγούστου παριλη[φέναι]* ἀπὸ γενήματος τῆς]  
*εὐτυχούς 5 ναίας ἰνδικτί[ονος τίτου]* καθε-]  
*στηκότας μέτρῳ δημοσίῳ]* κατενεγκού-]  
*μεν ἐπὶ τὴν λαμ(προτάτην) Ἀλεξ[ανδρ-]* ]  
 10 *πλήρης καὶ τῆς παραδό[σεως ἄποχα γράμματα ἐπενεγκεῖν εἰς τὸ ἐν*  
μηδενὶ μεμφθῆναι ἢ ἔνοχοι]  
 εἴη μὲν τῷ θεῖον ὄρκῳ. [

(m. 2?) *εἰς πλ(οῖον) ἰδιωτικὸν [*  
*ἀπὸ τοῦ [Ο]ξυρυγ[χίτου]*  
*οὗ ἐγγυητῆς [*

15 (m. 3) *Ἀψ[ρήλ]ιος . . . . [*  
*]. . . . [*

Back ↓

(m. 4) *(ἀρτάβαι) Ἰ[*



ὦν

πολ(ιτῶν) (ἀρτάβαι) ιθ . .  
 κωμ(ητῶν) (ἀρτάβαι) Γςβ . . .  
 5 ταμ(ιακῶν?) (ἀρτάβαι) ξζς'

1 ὑπατείας; initial *v* much enlarged      2 γαῖω?  
 traces unrecognizable)      5 l. Ἀλεξανδρείας      4 *vos* a correction (over initial *ι* and other  
 7–8 l. καθεστηκότος      9 λαμ)      11 l. θεῖω      6 l. ἀγούστου παρεληφέναι      7 l. νέας  
 12 πλ'      14 εγ' ὑνητης?      paragraphus across full width of surviving papyrus

Back

1 σ̄      3 πολ̄σ̄      4 κωμ̄σ̄      5 ταμ̄σ̄ (μ̄ ligatured to artaba sign)

‘In the consulship of Claudius Mamertinus [and Flavius Nevitta, *viri clarissimi*.]

‘To Gaius Julius Leucadius, [strategus of the Oxyrhynchite,] from Aurelii Petrus son of Agathinus [and *x* son of *x* and *x* son of *x* and] Sarapion son of Plutarchus and Dorotheus [son of Arsinoüs, all councillors of the city of the Oxyrhynchites, overseers] of wheat for Alexandria. We acknowledge . . . eternal Augustus, that we have received [in wheat . . . from the produce of the] propitious 6th new indiction . . . ascertained by public measure . . . and we will convey [the cargo] down to the most illustrious [?metropolis of] the Alexandrians . . . in full, and [that we will bring back receipts] for the transfer [so as to be blamed in nothing, or] may we be [liable to the consequences of] the divine oath.’

(2nd hand?) ‘On to a private boat . . . from the Oxyrhynchite . . . : of which the guarantor . . .’

(3rd hand) ‘I, Aurelius . . .’

Back (4th hand):

‘3000[+] artabas.

‘Of which:

‘From metropolitans: 19 (+ fractions) artabas.

‘From villagers: 3252 (+ fractions) artabas.

‘From persons under the *fiscus*: 67<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> artabas.’

1 The consular date has been written with a finer pen; whether it should be attributed to another hand is less clear. *K* of *Κλαυδίου* has been re-inked by the thicker pen of the text below. This could suggest that the sheet had been ready-prepared with the consuls. In 2 the analysis of the hand and pen is less clear. It is possible that the sheet was ready-prepared with the strategus as well as the consuls.

Back

The small sums amount to 338<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> plus the fractions in lines 3–4, = τλης plus, and this needs to be lost from the lacuna in line 1.

R. A. COLES

## 4610. UNDERTAKING TO DELIVER BARLEY

119/38

14 × 26 cm

13 June 363

Presumably the delivery here was to Alexandria, although the statement to this effect has not survived (no doubt it came at the end of 10, and we would expect Alexandria to be named after *κριθῶν* in 6; cf. 4613). It is not clear how many *ἐπιμεληταί* functioned here. One of them, Serenus son of Eusebius, recurs in 4612 (same year, Mesore, but for wheat) and 4613 (364, for barley). Another is son of the well known former *curator civitatis* Flavius Julianus, for whom and for whose family see 4606 3 n., 16 n. with references. The son's name is restored here (4, 16) as Gennadius, largely on the basis of 4613 3 (where however his father is given as simply Julianus).

The amount to be delivered here is 3300 artabas; see 10 and 14. No doubt this amount was re-stated in a docket on the back, as in the others of this group, but only faint traces remain and nothing can be discerned except the figure *Τ*. The boat being used for the transport was a private vessel belonging to the *procurator Heptanomia* (13) or to someone on his staff (depending on the reading of the middle of that line). This is a very late reference to that office, cf. R. Delmaire, *CRIPÉL* 10 (1988) 128, 138, and the holder at this period is not otherwise known. See also Delmaire, *Largesses sacrées et res privata*, 210.

[ὕπατειας τοῦ δεσπότης ἡμῶν Ἰουλιανοῦ] αἰωνίου Ἀυγούστου τὸ δ[ὲ] καὶ  
 Φλαουίου Καλλουστίου τοῦ]  
 [λαμπροτάτου ἐπάρχου τοῦ ἱεροῦ πραι]τωρίου, Πάπυι ἰθ̄.  
 [Γαίῳ Ἰουλίῳ Λ]εξκαδίῳ στρατηγῶ [Ῥοξυρυγίτου]  
 [παρὰ Ἀύρηλιῶν Γενναδ]ί[ου] υἱοῦ Ἰουλιανοῦ ἀπὸ λογιστ[ῶ]ν [   
 5 [?καὶ Ἰέ]ρακος ἀδελφοῦ καὶ Σερήνου Εὐσεβίου καὶ Α. [   
 [τῶν πάν]των βουλ[ευτῶν] τῆς Ῥοξυρυγιτῶν πόλεως ἐπιμελητῶν  
 [κριθῶν Ἀλεξανδρείας(?). ὁμολογοῦμεν ὁμνύντες  
 [τὸν σεβά]μιον θίον ὄρκον τοῦ δεσπότης ἡμῶν Ἰουλιανῶ [αἰωνίου  
 Ἀυγούστου παρεληφέναι παρὰ]  
 [τῶν ἐξῆς ἐγγεγρα]μμένων καὶ ἐνβεβλήθαι εἰς τὸ ὑποτεταχμ[ένον πλοῖον  
 ἀπὸ γενήματος τῆς x ἰνδικτίονος]  
 [κριθῆς νέ]ας καθαράς ἀδόλου καὶ ἀβρόχου καὶ ἐκτὸς πάσης [αἰτίας  
 καθεστηκυίας μέτρῳ δημοσίῳ]  
 10 [μετρῆσει τῇ κε]λυθίσοι ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ (ἀρτάβας) Ἰτ' τὸν δὲ γόμον  
 κατεν[εγκοῦμεν ἐπὶ ]  
 [?καὶ παραδώ]σομεν εἰς τοὺς ἐκεῖσαι δημοσίους θησαυροὺς ἀριθμῶ  
 πλῆ[ρης καὶ τῆς παραδόσεως ἀποχα]  
 [γράμματ]α ἐπενεγκεῖν εἰς τὸ ἐν μηδενὶ μεμφθῆναι ἢ ἔνοχοι [εἶημεν τῶ

- θείω ὄρκω. ]
- (m. 2) [εἰς πλοῖον ἰδι]ωτικὸν . . [ . . ] . . ους ἐπιτρόπου Ἐπτανο[μίας  
[ἀπὸ τοῦ Ὁξυρ]υγχι[του αἰ π(ροκείμεναι) τῶν κριθ(ῶν) (ἀρτάβαι) Ἰ.τ' οὐδ  
ἐγ(γυητή)ς ]
- 15 [ ] (vac.)
- (m. 3) [Ἀυρήλιος ?Γεν]νά[διος] Ἰουλιανοῦ παρείληφα ἅμα τοῖς κο[ινωνοῖς ]  
[ c. 10 ] .ια . . . . . c καὶ παραδώσω ὡς πρόκειται [
- (m. 4) [ c. 7 παρ]αδώσω ὡς πρόκειται.

4 ὑιοῦιουλιανου 6 βουλ' 7 1. θεῖον ἰουλιανου 8 1. ἐμβεβλήσθαι ὑποτεταγμενον  
10 1. κελευθεῖςη αϞ 11 1. ἐκείε 12 επενεγ'κειω 14 αι² κριθ'Ϟ (for the form cf. 4609  
back 5) εγ'' 16 ἰουλιανου; 1. Ἰουλιανοῦ

‘In the consulship of our master Julianus, eternal Augustus, for the 4th time and Flavianus Sallustius, *vir clarissimus*, prefect of the sacred praetorium, Payni 19.

‘To Gaius Julius Leucadius, strategus of the Oxyrhynchite, from Aurelii Gennadius(?) son of Julianus former *curator* [and  $x$  son of  $x$  and] Hierax his brother and Serenus son of Eusebius and [ $x$  son of  $x$ ], all councillors of the city of the Oxyrhynchites, overseers [of barley for Alexandria (?). We acknowledge, swearing the] august divine oath by our master Julianus, eternal Augustus, that we have received from those listed below and loaded on to the boat specified hereunder, from the produce of the  $n$ th indiction, a total of 3300 artabas of barley that is new, pure, free from guile and dry and clear of all blame, ascertained by public measure according to the ordained method of measurement, and we will convey the cargo down [to . . . and] we will transfer(?) it to the public granaries there, to the full amount, and that we will bring back receipts for the transfer so as to be blamed in nothing, or may we be liable to the consequences of the divine oath.’

(2nd hand) ‘On to a private boat belonging to . . . procurator of the Heptanomia . . . from the Oxyrhynchite, the aforesaid 3300 artabas of barley: of which the guarantor . . .’

(3rd hand) ‘I, Aurelius Gennadius(?), son of Julianus, have received jointly with my colleagues . . . and I will hand them over as aforesaid.’

(4th hand) ‘. . . I will hand them over as aforesaid.’

4 For the restoration Γενναδ[ί]ου see the introd.

6 κριθῶν. For the plural cf. 4613 5, and also 14 here.

7–8 παρὰ τῶν ἐξῆς ἐγγεγραμμένων (cf. 4613 7) should imply that a (summarized?) tabulated list under the headings πολιτῶν and κομητῶν would have followed; cf. 4599, 4611–12. For this appendage as a regular part of texts of this type, see the introd. above to 4606–13. The ἐπιμεληταί did not of course receive the grain direct from the contributors, and indeed the κομητῶν contributions in these lists are already summarized by village under the name of an agent; some of the personal names that appear under the πολιτῶν heading (frequently the names of officials) might also be those of collecting-agents rather than the original contributors.

10 The initial correction seems extreme; the writer’s script may be a little contorted, but on the whole his

spelling is unexceptionable. However, the word is to be expected at this point (cf. **4606** 9, **4612** 9), and no other interpretation suggests itself that would be close to the letters written.

Was  $\Upsilon\tau$  added in by the hand of the boat section (lines 13 ff.) below? The ink does seem to change.

13 ] ους. Uncertain c may alternatively be the initial stroke of an elaborate ε.

14 αἱ π(ροκείμενα) τῶν κριθ(ῶν). Cf. **4613** 12, and for the plural also line 6 above.

R. A. COLES

#### 4611. UNDERTAKING TO DELIVER WHEAT

119/96

21 × 25 cm

July/August 363  
Plates VI–VII

This item, now separately framed, was originally joined to **4612** as part of a *τόμος συγκολλήσιμος*. The hand of col. i here is the same as that of **4608** of the year before as well perhaps as that of some very much earlier items: see **4608** introd.

Of col. i, the sworn undertaking itself, only some line ends survive, but it is easily established that the line-length once matched that of the attached wide **4612**, the most fully preserved of this group. Col. ii, in a more formal second hand, preserves the summarized list of municipal and villagers' contributions of the commodity to be delivered, as does **4612** in the same formal hand. Such a list I suppose once followed **4610** and **4613** at least. Parallel lists feature in LX **4089**, **4599**, and **4607** above, and see the general introduction to **4606–13**.

The date is restored on the basis of **4612**: the only element surviving here is the month Mesore (July–August), col. ii 17, the same month as in **4612** (col. ii 10). This is late for Julian, deceased June 26/27 near the Tigris (D. Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle*<sup>2</sup> 324), but the year is confirmed by the consular date in **4612** col. i 1–2, and the restoration of Julian's name in col. i 3 here is confirmed by its presence in **4612** col. i 6.

On the back is a one-line docket giving the figure of 3750 artabas from villagers' contributions. This creates a problem. Col. ii 2 on the front gives a total of 3650 artabas, and this correctly sums up the municipal contributions for the 7th indiction (535 artabas), 7 artabas under the heading *θης(αυροῦ)*, which I understand as a giro-transfer from the named village, and the (partly restored) figure of 3108 artabas for villagers' contributions, provided we discount a further 100(?) artabas listed as municipal contributions for the 6th indiction (lines 14–15, possibly a later insertion) although line 2 does not specify that 3650 artabas is the figure for the 7th indiction only. The sum of 3750 artabas on the back might then equal this amount but with the 100 artabas in lines 14–15 included, except that 3750 is not the figure for villagers' contributions as given on the front. It can surely be no more than coincidence that 3750 artabas from villagers' contributions is the correct total figure for the delivery in **4612**, no municipal contributions being involved there: **4612** has its own (abraded) docket on its back, and the figure of 3750 artabas under discussion is firmly on the back of **4611**.

Also on the back, written down the fibres (i.e. at right angles to the 3750 artabas docket)

and in a large script by the hand of front col. ii, is a personal name and patronymic. This is not paralleled elsewhere in the group; I suppose that it may be the name of one of the ἐπιμεληταί involved in the transaction, none of whose names survives in col. i on the front. Although many of the ἐπιμεληταί in these documents function in more than one of them, this person (Josepus son of Timotheus) does not recur elsewhere.

There are three sheet-joins associated with **4611**. (a) There is a very clear manufacturer's three-layer join just beyond the ends of col. i. The ends of the horizontal strips are uneven in length and splay out in a way suggesting the deliberate omission in manufacture of the vertical fibres for 2 cm behind them: cf. **4608** introd. (b) At the right edge of col. ii, but overrun by the end of line 2, is a four-layer kollesis. I suggest that the upper layer represents the end of a roll to which another sheet (or more) was glued before the text of col. ii was written. This extension was then cut, just beyond join (b) (5 cm beyond it at the top, 3 at the foot), and (c) glued as a τόμος-join to **4612**. The horizontal measurement in the heading above is to this join (c), not to the edge of the papyrus as currently framed.

Col. i

	·   ·   ·   ·   ·   ·   ·   ·   ·   ·	
		]ου
		ἐπιμε]λητῶν
		τοῦ δεσπότη ἡμῶν Ἰουλιανοῦ] αἰωνίου
	[Ἀγούστου	ε]ύτυχου
5	[x ἰνδικτίονος	]ω
		λ]αμ( )
		παρα]δῶσεως
		]
		vac.
		].
	·   ·   ·   ·   ·   ·   ·   ·   ·   ·	

Col. ii

(m. 2)	ἔστι δέ	
	αἴτου ὑποστάσεως ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ	ἀ(ρτάβαι) Ἰ.χν'
	οὕτως	
	ζS'' ἰνδικτίονος	
5	πολ(ιτῶν)	
	Γερόντιος Παιανίου	(ἀρτάβαι) φλα
	Διονύσιος ἀπὸ β(ενε)φ(ικιαρίων)	(ἀρτ.) γ
	Πτολεμαῖος Κολλούθου	(ἀρτ.) α

10 θη(αυρου) Κενώθ(εω) Ζευήρου Τούρβωνος απ . .  
 δι(ά) Φιλονίκου Ζωΐλου ἀ(ρτ.) ζ  
 κωμητ(ῶν)  
 ζ' πάγου Σεφῶ  
 ] . . . δι(ά) Παύλου Ἀμάειτος (ἀρτ.) Ὑρ[η]  
 5}'' ἰνδικ(τίονος)  
 15 πολ(ιτῶν) Γερόντιος Παιανίου ἀ(ρτ.) ρ'  
 (γίνονται) ὁμοῦ χιρ(ιστικῶ) αἰ προκείμεναι  
 ὑπατίας τῆς προκ(ειμένης), Μεσορῆ . . .

Back

At top: (m. 3) κωμ(ητῶν) (ἀρτ.) Ὑρ  
 Down centre, → (m. 2) Ὑωσήπου Τιμοθέου

Col. i

6 λαμς 7 l. παραδόσεως

Col. ii

2 ὑποστασεως α̅ (so in 10, 15) 5 πολ' 6 ⅈ (so in 7, 8, 13) 7 βφ 9 θης'κεωθ  
 10 δι' ζωΐλου 11 κωμητ 13 δι' l. Ἀμάειτος 14 ἠδ' 15 πολ' παϊανίου 16 /  
 χιρσαι? 1. χιρ(ιστικῶ) 17 l. ὑπατίας προκ

Back

κωμ? ⅈ

(Col. ii)

(2nd hand) 'As follows:

'Wheat, assessed on property, total art. 3650

'Thus:

'7th indiction.

'Citizens:

'Gerontius son of Paeanius art. 531

'Dionysius, former *beneficiarius* art. 3

'Ptolemaeus son of Colluthus art. 1

'Through the granary at Ceuothis, Severus son of Turbo, . . .  
 through Philonicus son of Zoilus art. 7

'Villagers:

'7th pagus, Sepho,

. . . through Paulus son of Amaïs art. 3108

'6th indiction.

'Citizens: Gerontius son of Paeanius art. 100.

‘Total, together with giro-transfers, the aforesaid (artabas).  
‘The aforesaid consulship, Mesore *x*.’

(Back, 3rd hand)

‘Villagers: art. 3750.’

(Back, 2nd hand, 90° from above docket)

‘(From?) Josepus son of Timotheus.’

Col. i

1 Three lines, probably, have been lost above this: two for the consuls, and one for the address to the strategus.

10ν could in theory be the end of the address to the Oxyrhynchite strategus, but comparison with both the wording and line levels of the adjacent **4612** suggest that these letters belong to the sequence of names of the ἐπιμεληταί.

Col. ii

6 Cf. 15. I suppose this Gerontius may well be the son of the former *curator civitatis* Flavius Paeanius, in that office in 336 and strategus in 351–2; see P. Oxy. LIV pp. 227–8 and LX **4089** and **4091**.

9 For the village Ceuothis see P. Pruneti, *I centri abitati dell'Ossirinchi* 84.

At end, traces after απ are scanty; one or two letters may be followed by a raised letter or abbreviation-mark.

12 For the village Sepho see Pruneti op. cit. 176–7. Its location in the 7th pagus was already known.

13 The initial traces (possibly complete—i.e. delete the bracket—and ending with a deep descending diagonal) are a puzzle. They are aligned vertically with the beginning of κωμητ(ών) in 11, but do not quite align horizontally with the rest of 13. I do not think they are the end of a long line from col. i.

15 Beyond ρ' I think only an accidental blot.

16 For the expansion and interpretation of χιρς as χειρικτικῶ (sc. πυρῶ) cf. XLIV **3169** introd. The reference here will be back to the seven artabas entered in 9–10, which I suppose represent a giro-transfer.

17 It is not clear if the day of the month is represented by two digits or by one digit and a numeral marker. An abraded λ (30th) is a possibility.

Back: it would be equally possible to read Ἰωσῆ τοῦ Τιμοθέου.

R. A. COLES

#### 4612. UNDERTAKING TO DELIVER WHEAT TO ALEXANDRIA

119/92

36 × 26 cm

July/August 363  
Plates VI–VII

This item was originally attached on the left to **4611** in a τόμος συγκολλήσιμος. It is the most fully preserved of the group **4606** and **4608–13**, despite its poor condition, and has provided much of the basis both for restoration in the other texts and for understanding the formal layout of these documents, including the ‘boat description’ section (here col. i 13–16) in its larger more formal hand and the presence of a second column listing in summary form the commodity to be delivered, the quantity and its source. Cf. **4611** introd. and the general introduction to **4606–13**.

In this example five(?) Oxyrhynchite councillors, functioning as ἐπιμεληταί κύτου

Ἀλεξανδρείας, swear to C. Julius Leucadius the Oxyrhynchite strategus that they will deliver 3750 artabas of wheat (approaching 50 tons) to the state granaries in Alexandria. The boat on to which they say they have already loaded the grain is a private vessel in interesting ownership, the property of an *a numeris* in the *officium* of the *dux*: see col. i 13 n. The itemized second column is in the same hand as the second column of **4611**. All the grain here derives from village contributions, all in fact from one village (Palosis) in the 8th pagus. On the back stood the usual docket, now badly abraded; there are parts of three and perhaps as many as five lines, but scarcely a letter is recognizable.

The *ἐπιμεληταί* swear an oath by the emperor Julian, who deceased a month or more before the date of the text. The date is assured by the consular formula for 363 (col. i 1–2), a reference to the ‘new’ 7th indiction (beginning 1 May 363), col. i 8, and the month Mesore (= July/August), day lost, in col. ii 10. These data were used for the restoration of the date of **4611**; see introd.

For the join that attached **4612** to **4611**, see also **4611** introd. The two are now separately framed, but the division is not quite at their original point of join; the blank overlapping right edge of **4611** remains affixed to the left margin of **4612** in the latter’s frame. The horizontal measurement given above starts from the edge of **4611**, not from the left edge of the papyrus as now framed. Further sheet joins, both three-layer manufacturer’s joins, are at the end of *Τιμα[γ]ένης*, i 19, and then again more or less at the line-ends of col. i (overrun by some lines, e.g. 18); the visible kollema width is 17.5 cm.

## Col. i

[ c. 7 ] occasional traces; c. 26 letters [ c. 11 ] Φλαουίω Καλ[λουτίου  
 τ]οῦ λαμ[[προτάτου]] ἐπάρχου  
 2 [τ]οῦ ἰ[ε]ροῦ πραιτωρίου[υ.]  
 3 [Γ]αίω Ἰουλίω Ἀευκαδίω [στρ]ατη[γ]ῶ [Ο]ξ[υ]ρυγχ[ί]του  
 4 [παρ]ὰ Ἀὑρηλίων . . . [ . . . ] . . . [ . . . ] καὶ Ἐ[ . . . ] εἰ . . .  
 ?Ἐ[ρ]ήνου καὶ Ἐρ[ε]ν[ο]ῦ Ἐὐσεβίου καὶ  
 5 [Ἀμμω]νίου Ἀπίωνος [κα]ὶ Ἐ[α]ραπίων[ος] Πλουτάρχ[ο]υ τῶ[ν]  
 πά[ν]των βουλ[ε]υτῶν τῆς Ὀξυρυγχ[ι]τῶν πόλεως ἐπιμελ[η]τῶν  
 6 [ε]ἰ[τ]οῦ Ἀλεξ[ανδ]ρίας. ὁμολογ[οῦ]μεν ὡμν[ύ]ντες τῶν σεβάσμι[ο]ν θίων  
 ὄρκον [τ]οῦ [δε]σπότης ἡμῶν Ἰουλιαν[ο]ῦ [α]ἰ[ωνίου]  
 7 Ἀγούστου παρὶληφέν[αι κα]ὶ ἐμβεβλήσθαι εἰς τὸ ἐξῆς ὑποστ[ε]τα[γ]μένον  
 πλοίων ἀπὸ γενήματος  
 8 τῆς εὐτυχοῦς ζ) νέα[ς] ἰνδικτ[ί]ονος ζήτου νέου καθαροῦ ἀκρίθου καὶ  
 ἀβρόχου καὶ ἐκτὸς πάσ[η]ς αἰτίας καθεστηκότος  
 9 μέτρῳ δημοσίῳ μ[ε]τρῆ[σει] τῆς κελουσί[σ]ης ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἀ[ρ]άβας  
 Ἰψ[η]ν[ί]· τὸν δὲ γόμον κατενεγκοῦμεν ἐπὶ τῆ[ς]



- 10 [λ]αμ(προτάτης) Ἀλεξανδρ[ε]ω[ν] μ[η]τροπόλ[ε]ως εἰς [το]ὺς ἐκείαι  
 δημοσίους θησαυροὺς ἀριθμῶ πλήρης καὶ [τ]ῆ[ε]ς
- 11 [πα]ραδ[ό]σε[ω]ς . . . [ . . . . . ] τὰ ἐπεξεργ[ε]ῖν εἰς τὸ ἐν μηδενὶ  
 μεμθῆναι ἢ ἔνοχοι εἴημεν [τ]ῶ
- 12 [θείω ὄ]ρκω. ἔ[στι δ]έ·
- 13 (m. 2) εἰς πλοῖον ἰδ[ιω]τικὸν Θέωνος ἀννούμερος τάξεως τοῦ κυρίω μου  
 14 τ[ο]ῦ λαμ(προτάτου) δουκὸς [οὔ] κυβερ(νήτης) ὄρωρ [ . ] . . ιος ἀπὸ  
 Διοκλητιανοῦ πόλεως τῆς Θηβαΐδος
- 15 αἰ π(ροκείμεναι) τοῦ κύτου ἀρτάβαι) Ἰψν'' ο[ὗ] ἐγγυητῆς Μου[ε]τῆς  
 . . . [ . ] . . ιου ἀπὸ τῆς [ . . . ] .
- 16 πόλεως [ . . . ] . Ἄγγιανου τ[ρ]ιβούνου.
- 17 (m. 3) Ἀβρήλιος Καρ[απίων Πλου]τάρ[χο]ς[υ] συνπαρέληφα ἅμα τοῖς  
 κοι(νωνοῖς) τὰς τοῦ κύτου καθαρῶ
- 18 ἀρτάβας τ[ρ]ις χιλίας εἴ[πη]τακο[ε]ς πεντήκοντα μόν[α]ς[ε] καὶ  
 συμπαράδωσω ὡς πρόκειται.
- 19 (m. 4) Ἀβρήλιος Τιμα[γ]έντης συνπαρ[ε]λήφα ἅμα τοῖς κοι(νωνοῖς) καὶ  
 συμπαράδωσω ὡς π(ρόκειται).

Col. ii

- (m. 5) ἔ[στι δ]έ·  
 κύτου ὑποστάξεως [ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἀ(ρτ.) Ἰψν]  
 οὕτως·  
 ζ[ε]'' ἰνδικτίονος
- 5 κωμητῶν  
 ἠ'' πάγου Παλώσεως δι(ὰ)  
 Θέωνος καὶ του γκ. ι  
 κ. ι. [ . ] . . [ . ] ων [(ἀρτ.) Ἰψν]  
 (γίνονται) αἰ π(ροκείμεναι).
- 10 ὑπατία τῆς προκ(ειμένης), [M]εσορῆ . . .

Col. i

1 l. Φλαοίου 5 βουλ' οξυρυς? ἐπιμελ(ητών)? 6 l. Ἀλεξανδρείας, ὀμνύντες τὸν,  
 θεῖον ὄρκον 7 l. παρεληφέναι, πλοῖον 9 l. κελευθείη α<sup>ο</sup> 1. κατενεγκοῦμεν 10 l.  
 ἐκείσε 11 Supralinear traces above end of παραδόσεως 13 l. ἀννουμέρου, κυρίου 14 λαμς''  
 κυβερ θηβαΐδος 15 αἰ? α<sup>ο</sup> εγγυητης? 17 l. συνπαρέληφα κοτ 19 l. συνπαρέληφα  
 κοτ 1. συμπαράδωσω πρ

Col. ii

2 ὑποστασεως? 6 δι' 9 /αι? 10 ὑπατίας προκ 1. ὑπατείας

Col. i

'In the consulship of our master Julianus Augustus for the 4th time and Flavius Salustius, *vir clarissimus*, prefect of the sacred praetorium.

'To Gaius Julius Leucadius, strategus of the Oxyrhynchite, from Aurelii . . . (son of) Serenus and Serenus son of Eusebius and Ammonius son of Apion and Sarapion son of Plutarchus, all councillors of the city of the Oxyrhynchites, overseers of wheat for Alexandria. We acknowledge, swearing the august divine oath by our master Julianus, eternal Augustus, that we have received and loaded on to the boat specified hereunder, from the produce of the propitious 7th new indiction, a total of 3750 artabas of wheat that is new, pure, free from barley and dry and clear of all blame, ascertained by public measure according to the ordained method of measurement, and we will convey the cargo down to the most illustrious metropolis of the Alexandrians, to the public granaries there, to the full amount and that we will bring back . . . for the transfer so as to be blamed in nothing, or may we be liable to the consequences of the divine oath. As follows:'

(2nd hand) 'On to a private boat belonging to Theon, *a numeris* in the *officium* of my lord the *dux*, *vir clarissimus*, of which the steersman is Horus son of -is from Diocletianopolis in the Thebaid, the aforesaid 3750 artabas of wheat: of which the guarantor is Moses son of . . . from the . . . city . . . Annianus, tribune.'

(3rd hand) 'I, Aurelius Sarapion son of Plutarchus, have received jointly with my colleagues the three thousand seven hundred and fifty artabas of pure wheat, exactly, and I will jointly hand them over as aforesaid.'

(4th hand) 'I, Aurelius Timagenes, have received (the artabas of wheat) jointly with my colleagues and I will jointly hand (them) over as aforesaid.'

Col. ii

(5th hand) 'As follows:

'Wheat, assessed on property

total 3750 artabas.

'Thus:

'7th indiction:

'Villagers:

'8th pagus, Palosis, through Theon

and . . .

3750 artabas.

'Total the aforesaid.

'The aforesaid consulship, Mesore x.'

Col. i

<sup>1</sup> Very scanty traces of the consular formula remain at the top edge of the papyrus in the first part of the line; I have been unable to assign them with certainty to particular letters. The expected but untranscribed part of the formula would be *ὑπατείας τοῦ δεσπότου ἡμῶν Ἰουλιανοῦ αἰωνίου ἀδγούστου τὸ δ' καί*.

3 The transcript does not display the format correctly: the elements of the address are spread out across the full width of the column.

4 I have failed to elicit the names of the declarants from the scanty and abraded traces in the first half of the line. The space seems rather long for name, patronymic, *καὶ* name before ?*Κε*]ρῆνον but not long enough for name, patronymic, *καὶ* name, patronymic, *καὶ* name. We do at least want *Τιμαγένου* (cf. his subscription in 19); he was son of Serenus (cf. **4613**), but his name will not fit the traces before ?*Κε*]ρῆνον here. Although most of the declarants in **4606–13** appear more than once, it may be that we have at least one new name to contend with here.

10 Ἀλεξανδρο[ε]ω[ν]. The printed text is mere guesswork (but cf. [c]l[τ]ο[v] Ἀλε]ξανδρίας in 6). There are specks of ink over most of the length of the word, but apart from initial *α* (and even that is not certain) not one can be assigned to any letter with certainty.

11 ἀποχα γράμματα is expected following *παραδόσεως* (cf. **4608** 10), but cannot be verified from the scanty traces.

12 εἴ[ετι δ]ε. Not certainly present in any of the others of this group, except **4607**, which is somewhat different. In **4613**, uncertain slight traces in the gap between 10–11 may indicate that it might once have stood there; similarly in **4606** 15.

13 For ἀγνούμερος see J. R. Rea, *Tyche* 11 (1996) 192–3. **4612** is the papyrus referred to there on p. 193.

14 For Diocletianopolis see A. Calderini and S. Daris, *Diζ. geogr.* ii. 106 and Suppl. ii. 44.

16 An Annianus, tribune, is attested in LXIII **4370** 13 nearly ten years earlier as an Oxyrhynchite resident.

Col. ii

6 For the village Palosis see P. Pruneti, *I centri abitati dell'Ossirinchite* 134–5. Its location in the 8th pagus was already known.

7–8 End of 7 probably *καί*; but what precedes is problematical.

The beginning of 8 could suggest *κοινωνῶν*, but I cannot fit it to the traces beyond *κοιν*[ (and *ν* could be *ς*). Though *ων* is possible at the end, the rest of the traces require something wider.

8 ψ[ is expected, since there is only this entry to make up the total already (but less than reliably) supplied by the previous column (lines 9, 15, 18); nevertheless, it is not easy to read it, and ?*Τ*γ[ would be much easier.

R. A. COLES

### 4613. UNDERTAKING TO DELIVER BARLEY TO ALEXANDRIA

119/85

19.5 × 26 cm

Early 364

This, the latest of the group, is also the last evidence by name for a strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome (see **4606–13** introd.). The declaration comes from five councillors of Oxyrhynchus functioning as *ἐπιμεληταὶ κριθῶν Ἀλεξανδρείας*. The first named of these (3), Gennadius son of Julianus, I suppose may be the younger son of that Julianus who had been *curator civitatis* in 329–31 (P. Oxy. LIV p. 226). I have restored Gennadius' name in **4610** 4 and 16, and see also **4606** 16 n.

The text formed part of a *τόμος συγκολλήσιμος*, with a heavy four-layer join on the left. No writing survives on the front of this preceding sheet, but there are scanty traces on its back. The format of **4613** is that now familiar from the earlier texts in this group, including the use of a larger script for the 'boat' section (lines 11–13), but the wording at line 9 is different and much shorter.

There is a three-layer manufacturer's kollesis at the right edge of the surviving sheet, the break largely coinciding with it.

On the back there are remains of a docket, at the foot (in terms of the front) and written the other way up.

ὑπατείας τοῦ δεσπότης ἡμῶν Ἰουλιανοῦ αἰωνίου Αὐγούστου [

Γαίῳ Ἰουλίῳ Λευκαδίῳ στρατηγῷ Ὀξυρρυχίτου

παρὰ Αὐρηλίων Γενναδίῳ Ἰουλιανοῦ καὶ Κερρήν[ου] Εὐ[ύ]κεβίου κ[αὶ x

son of]

[.] . . . . . καὶ Καραπίωνος Πλουτάρχου καὶ Τιμαγένους Κερρή[νου τῶν

πάντων βουλευτῶν τῆς]

5 Ὀ[ξ]υρ[υγ]χιτῶν πόλεως ἐπιμελητῶν κριθῶν Ἀλ[ε]ξ[αν]δρείας.

ὁμολογοῦμεν ὀμνύντες]

τὸν Κεβάκιον θῖον ὄρκον τ[ο]ῦ δεσπότης ἡμῶν Ἰουλιανοῦ αἰωνίου

Αὐγούστου παρεληφέναι]

[πα]ρὰ τῶν ἐξῆς ἐγγεγραμμένον καὶ ἐμβεβλήσθαι εἰς τὸ [ὑποτεταγμένον

πλοῖον ἀπὸ]

γενήματος τῆς εὐτυχούς ζ' ἰνδικτίωνος . . . . . [

. [ . . . πα]ραδοθείας τοῖς κατὰ Ἀλεξάνδριαν . . . . . [ . . . ] . . . [

10 . [ . . . κ[αὶ] μ[η]δὲν διεψεῦσθαι ἢ ἔνοχοι εἶημεν τῷ θ[ε]ῷ ὄρκω.

(m. 2) εἰς πλ(οῖον) ἰδιωτικὸν Θέωνος Εὐκεβίου βουλ(ευτοῦ)

. . . . . ἀπὸ τοῦ Ὀξ(υρρυχίτου) αἰ π(ροκείμεναι) τῶν κρι(θῶν) ἀρτάβαι

x οὐ ἐγγυητῆς ὁ προ-]

κ[ε]ίμενος Θέων Εὐκεβίου βουλ(ευτής) [

(m. 3) [Αὐ]ρήλιος Κερρήνος Εὐκεβίου παρείληφα . [ . ] . [

15 . . . . . ἀρκίας πενήκοντα μόναι καὶ παραδύ[ω]

(m. 4) [Αὐ]ρήλιος Καραπίων συνπαρείληφα [

ὡς πρόκειται.

Back:

(m. 5) κριθ(ῶν) ζ' ἰνδικτίωνος

1 v of Ἰουλιανοῦ corr. End of line badly abraded 2 γαίῳ 3 Γενναδίου 4 1. Τιμαγένους  
6 1. θεῖον 7 1. ἐγγεγραμμένων 9 1. παραδοθείας, Ἀλεξάνδριαν 11 πλ? See note 12 οξ'αι?  
13 βουλ' 16 1. συμπαρείληφα

‘In the consulship of our master Jovianus eternal Augustus [ . . .

‘To Gaius Julius Leucadius, strategus of the Oxyrhynchite, from Aurelii Gennadius son of Julianus and Serenus son of Eusebius and *x* son of *x* and Sarapion son of Plutarchus and Timagenes son of Serenus, all councillors of the city of the Oxyrhynchites, overseers of barley for Alexandria. We acknowledge, swearing the august divine oath by our master Jovianus, eternal Augustus, that we have received from the persons listed below and loaded on to the boat specified hereunder, from the produce of the propitious 7th indiction, . . . transferred to the . . . at Alexandria . . . and to have been deceitful in nothing, or may we be liable to the consequences of the divine oath.’

(2nd hand) ‘On to a private boat belonging to Theon son of Eusebius . . . from the Oxyrhynchite, the aforesaid [*x* artabas] of barley: [of which the guarantor is the] aforesaid Theon son of Eusebius, councillor [’

(3rd hand) ‘I, Aurelius Serenus son of Eusebius, have received . . . *x* hundred and fifty, exactly, and I will hand them over [’

(4th hand) ‘I, Aurelius Sarapion, have jointly received . . . as aforesaid.’

Back:

(5th hand) ‘Barley, 7th indiction.’

1 No month is preserved in the document, but that its date must be in the first few months of 364 is indicated by the oath by Jovian in line 6. Jovian died on 17 February 364 (D. Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle*<sup>2</sup> 326), and while his name was not then dropped from the consular formula, nevertheless the oath by him here must imply not necessarily that he was still alive but at any rate that news of his death was not yet known in Oxyrhynchus. Support for the early dating is supplied by the reference to the 7th indiction (= 363/4) in line 8, giving a *terminus ante quem* of 1 May 364. We should be able to discount the idea that the reference might be to the transport of arrears of grain from the past 7th indiction.

The post-consulate of 363 was in use on 15 February 364 (P. Kell. I 42). The consuls of 364 (Jovian and Varronianus) have been attested in three other papyri:

P. Mich. inv. 4008.1 (ed. *ZPE* 105 (1995) 245–52) (month and day unknown) [ὑπατεία]ς τῶν δεσποτῶν ἡ]μῶν’

Ἰουουινίαν[οῦ] αἰωνίου Ἀβγούστου τὸ ας// | [καὶ Ο]ὐάρρωνειανοῦ τοῦ ἐπιφανεστάτου

CPR X 107r.9 (26 July) ὑπατείας Ἰουουινίαν[οῦ] κ[αὶ] Οὐάρρωνειανοῦ [

P. Kell. I 32.17–28 (28 October) ὑπατείας Ἰουανῶ καὶ Βαρωνιανῶ | παιδὸς αὐτοῦ

The consulship has also been restored in P. Lips. 13 by C. Zuckerman, *ZPE* 100 (1994) 203–4 (= BL X 95), who has redated the text to 22 October 364. **4613** apparently had the same consular formula as P. Mich. inv. 4008 (where restore τ[οῦ] δεσπότητος ἡ]μῶν); the Michigan papyrus comes from the Small Oasis, adjacent to Oxyrhynchus, and may well attest Oxyrhynchite patterns. So the complete text should have read ὑπατείας τοῦ δεσπότητος ἡμῶν Ἰουουινίαν αἰωνίου Ἀβγούστου [τὸ ας καὶ Οὐάρρωνειανῶ τοῦ ἐπιφανεστάτου (month and day)]. Contrast this formula with the short versions in the later CPR X 107 and P. Kell. I 32 (and cf. P. Kell. I 42.28 n.), which must postdate the news of Jovian’s death.

The odd PSI I 90, dated by the postconsulate of 363 on Phaophi 20 = 17 October 364, may reflect the political uncertainty of the period, see Zuckerman, loc. cit. 203.

2 The strategus’ name is heavily inked, with staining especially at the beginning of *Λευκαδίω*, but is not obviously a correction or even re-written. Has it been added in? End of line badly abraded.

3 *Κερην-* seems assured despite the abrasion. We then expect *Εὐκεβίου* (cf. Serenus’ subscription in 14), and I have transcribed accordingly, but the interpretation of the traces that this entails is highly subjective.

4 [. . .] . . . ζ. [A]πίωνος is a possibility, being the father of Ammonius who occurs as an ἐπιμελητής in **4608** and **4612** above, but the surface is too abraded for this to be any more than a guess.

7 [πα]ρὰ τῶν ἐξῆς ἐγγεγραμμένον (l. ἐγγεγραμμένων) implies that a tabulated list under the headings πολιτῶν and κωμητῶν followed; cf. **4611–12**. **4610** 8 probably had the same expression. For this appendage as a regular part of texts of this type, see the introd. above to **4606–13**.

8 γενήματος is expected, but the ductus can hardly be followed. The sequence μλτ is particularly difficult. The 7th indiction = 363/4.

At the end it might continue κριϑς ε? for κριθ(ῆς) ἐ(πι) τὸ αὐτό or ἐ(πι) τὸ αὐτό but that is mere conjecture. The abbreviation elsewhere is κριϑ.

11 πλ(οίου). Cf. the app. crit.; the form of the abbreviation is unclear. There is scanty unexplained ink slightly below the line beyond supposed λ, which may form part of the abbreviation.

Theon son of Eusebius was former prytanis by 370: XVII **2110** 30.

16 Aurelius Sarapion: see **4608** 15 n.

Back: more is expected below this—at least a note of the quantity of artabas involved in the transaction (cf. lines 8, 12, 15)—but not a trace is visible. The hand may be the same as that of the docketts on the backs of **4608**, **4609**, and **4611**.

R. A. COLES

#### 4614. DOCUMENT (PETITION?) ADDRESSED TO FLAVIUS STRATEGIUS I

105/16(a)

16 × 10.3 cm

Late fifth century

The top of a document addressed to Flavius Strategius I. It bears no date, but Strategius' titulature is partially the same as in P. Flor. III 325, of 20 May 489, see further 1 n., so the two documents should be near contemporary. It is earlier than XVI **1982**, of 497, since by that time Strategius was *comes domesticorum*. **4614** and P. Flor. III 325 provide the earliest evidence for his life and career.

A further point of interest is that this is the earliest text to show that Strategius I held the ripariate of Oxyrhynchus; P. Harr. inv. 550a attests him in the same capacity at a later date, 503 or 518. Strategius also appears as *riparius* of Heracleopolis in CPR XIV 48, of 506. The issue will be discussed in more detail in the publication of P. Harr. inv. 550a, forthcoming in *ZPE*.

Too little survives for the nature of the text to be determined, but the mention of Strategius' riparial office and his deputy suggests that it is a petition. For a discussion of petitions to *riparii* see P. Köln V 234 introd.

The back is blank, so far as it is preserved.

Φλ(αουίω) Στρατηγίω τῷ λαμπρο(στάτω) καὶ πολ(ιτενομένω) καὶ  
 ῥιπ[α]ρ[ί]ω τῆς Ὀξ(υρυγχιτῶν)  
 διὰ Θεοδώρου ὑποκαταστ(άτου) καὶ διαδόχ(ου)  
 παρὰ Αὐρ(ηλίας) Τιαρίης ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς  
 [πόμεω]ς [ c. 4 ]. [ c. 4 ]. [ c. 6 ]. [ c. 4 ]. [ c. 3 ] . . .

1 φλς λαμπρ πολς 2 υποκαταστς διαδοχς 3 αυρς

‘To Flavius Strategius, *vir clarissimus* and *curialis* and *riparius* [of the city of the Oxyrhynchites], through Theodorus, substitute and deputy, from Aurelia Tiaria, from the same city . . .’

1 Φλ(αουίω) Cτρατηγίω. This person is commonly called Fl. Strategius I. But the recent discovery of an older member of the family with this name suggests that it is the latter who should be called Fl. Strategius I. Although the ultimate proof is still missing, he was almost certainly the grandfather of our Strategius. A strong argument in favour of the ancestry is the full name of Apion II as it appears in his consular diptych: Fl. Strategius Apion Strategius Apion. These names probably commemorate his descent: ‘Apion, son of Strategius, grandson of Apion, great-grandson of Strategius’; cf. D. Feissel, I. Kaygusuz, *T&MByz* 9 (1985) 403 n. 17, and B. Salway, *JRS* 84 (1994) 141 n. 109, cf. 141–3 on the ‘new Roman polyonymy’ (but both notes rely on the erroneous data of *PLRE*; see 4615 4 n.); cf. also J. Gascou, *T&MByz* 9 (1985) 63 with n. 355, and D. Feissel in J. Diethart, D. Feissel, J. Gascou, *Tyche* 9 (1994) 27 and n. 66.

τῶ λαμπρ(στάτω) καὶ πολ(ιτενομένω) καὶ ῥιπ[α]ρ[ί]ω. For the collocation cf. CPR IX 36.3–4 (487/8) τῶ λα] μπροστάτω καὶ αἰδεσίμω πολι[τενομένω]; P. Amh. II 146 = M. Chr. 76.1 (V) Ἡρακλάμμωνος λαμπρο(στάτου) καὶ ῥιπαρ(ίου); P. Flor. III 343.1–2 (V) Ἀνδρέας λαμπρ(στάτος) | καὶ πολι(τενόμενος) τῆς Ἐρμουπολι(τῶν); also P. Flor. III 325.2 (see below).

λαμπρ(στάτω). The papyrus confirms the restoration of Strategius’ name in P. Flor. III 325.2 by O. Hornickel, *Ehnen- und Rangprädikate in den Papyrusurkunden* (1930) 11 n. 2 (= BL VII 53): [Φλ(αουίω) Cτρατηγίω τῶ ἐνδο]ξοστάτω [κ]αὶ πολι[τε]νομένω. The juxtaposition of ἐνδο]ξοστάτω and πολι[τε]νομένω would appear to cause a problem (for an attempt at an explanation see A. Laniado, *CE* 72 (1997) 139–40), but the papyrus has λαμπρ]ροστάτω: Prof. R. Pintaudi, who kindly examined the original at my request and supplied a photocopy of the papyrus, writes: ‘il ρ per quanto rovinato è ben riconoscibile e quindi λαμπρ]ροστάτω è sicuro’ (letter of 13.7.1998); cf. also τῆ ὑμῶν λαμπρότητι, applied to Strategius in line 7 of the same document.

By that date (489) the rank of *vir clarissimus* was not as elevated as in earlier times, but it ‘was still hereditary, the sons of all three [senatorial] classes being entitled to it’ (A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire* ii. 529). For other fifth-century *clarissimi* see A. Arjava, *Tyche* 6 (1991) 22–24.

πολι(τενομένω). The family was of curial origin. The earlier Strategius (see above) appeared as a πολιτενόμενος of Oxyrhynchus in L 3584, and may be the same person as the πολιτενόμενος of P. Heid. IV 314.6, and possibly P. Mil. II 64 (441); see LXIII 4389 1 n. The family continued to perform its curial duties in Oxyrhynchus at the time of its apogee, cf. SB XII 11079 (571).

ῥιπ[α]ρ[ί]ω τῆς Ὀξ(υρρυχιτῶν). Considerations of space suggest that the name of the city was abbreviated. For the supplement cf. P. Mil. II 45.3 (449), SB XVIII 13596.3 (464), XVI 1877 15 (c. 488); P. Gron. Amst. 1.2 (455) and SB XVIII 13127.3 (V/VI) add πόλεως after Ὀξυρρυχιτῶν. ῥιπ[α]ρ[ί]ω Ὀξ(υρρυχιτῶν) seems less likely, since the collocation last occurs in P. Sel. 8.3, of 421.

2 Θεοδώρου ὑποκαταστ(άτου) καὶ διαδόχ(ου). The same individual also appears in P. Flor. III 325.3 διὰ Θεοδώρου ὑποκαταστάτου. His second title here, διαδόχ(ου), is explained by Strategius’ tenure of the riparial office: Theodorus was Strategius’ deputy in issues related to the discharge of this civic *munus*. The purport of the other title, ὑποκαταστ(άτου), is less clear. It must be the genitive of (i) ὑποκαταστάτης, or (ii) ὑποκατάστατος. In view of their different verbal aspect, it is not easy to take the two words as equivalent, although they both refer to someone substituting for someone else. (i) occurs only in P. Lips. 55.9–10 (375–79) ἐπιμελητὴν ἦτοι (cf. BL I 209) ὑποκαταστάτην Ἀπολλωνίου Ἡρωνος. Mitteis, the editor of this papyrus, notes that this man ‘ist jedenfalls der Ersatzman, für einen durch Tod oder auf andere Weise in Wegfall gekommenen Liturgen’, an explanation which would have no bearing on our text. LSJ Rev. Suppl. s.v. translate ‘assistant καταστάτης’, which seems pure guesswork. (ii) is somewhat better attested:

(1) G. Goetz, *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum* ii. 466.29 Ὑποκαταστατος substitutus subrogatus || subrogatus iudex’.

(2) CChalc. act. 14 (ACO 2.1.3 p. 83.16) referring to someone who will ‘substitute’ in a bishopric (cited by G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* 1449, who renders ‘substituted’).

(3) Just. *Nov.* 22.44.9 referring to someone who will ‘substitute’ as heir if the primary heir declines (cited by LSJ Rev. Suppl. 302).

In Roman law a *substitutus* is usually an alternative heir (see *RE* s.v.), and this is the sense of *ὑποκατάστατος* in (3); but this does not seem appropriate in this context. What (1)–(3) have in common is the concept of filling a position when the primary holder is not available.

Theodorus seems to have acted regularly as Strategius’ representative in transactions at that time. One might compare his function to that of the *oiketes* Menas, who occurs from 523 onwards (see **4616** 4–6 n). But in the period that separates Theodorus from Menas, Strategius appears in the contracts without intermediaries (XVI **1982** of 497, LXVII **4615** of 505). I wonder whether the presence of Theodorus is related to Strategius’ young age: a man who died some time between 542 and 543 (see LXIII **4396** introd. para. 1), must have been very young, perhaps even a minor, in 489. We may here recall the formulation of P. Lips. 55, *ἐπιμελητὴν ἤτοι ὑποκαταστάτην*. In Greek *ἐπιμελητής* occasionally renders *curator*; see H. J. Mason, *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions* (1974) s.v.; and orphan minors may have *curatores* to look after their property (but I have not found an example from papyri of *ἐπιμελητής* in this meaning). They may also have *tutores*; and *substitutio*, normally the appointment of an alternative heir, may also denote the appointment of an alternative *tutor* (see *OLD* s.v. 2). In other words, lexically we may not be far from the world of minors (on these issues see B. Palme, *ZRG* 115 (1998) 306 n. 39 with references; A. Arjava, *ZPE* 126 (1999) 202–4); but Strategius, even if he were a minor, was not an orphan. Could it be that for some unknown reason Apion I had to leave the administration of the whole or part of his Oxyrhynchite estate to his son, who, however, was under-age, and unable fully to discharge this function in person? But we have no evidence that Apion had an estate in the area of Oxyrhynchus (XVI **1886**, referring to a *defensor civitatis* named Fl. Apion, is too uncertain to be useful). On the other hand, it is likely that early in his life Strategius was in control of an estate and liable to the curial duties on it. I have little doubt that Strategius I was the grandson of Strategius, *comes consistorii* (see above, 1 n. para. 1). The latter is certain to have had an estate in the region; his ‘daughter and heir’ Flavia Isis appears as a landowner in LXIII **4390**, of 469. For what it is worth, I wonder whether (a part of) the property of the early Strategius passed to his grandson upon his death. (This would mean that ‘Strategius I’ was born before 469.) But why is Apion I absent from the picture? Palme, *ZRG* 115 (1998) 289 ff., has shown that the legislation gave ample opportunity to a father to keep his possessions away from his daughter’s husband, if he did not have a son, after his death. We could imagine that something similar happened with Strategius and Apion, and Theodorus functioned as the substitute of Strategius, still under-age, in all important transactions. There is no need to assume that Apion was a son of the early Strategius and brother of Flavia Isis (he could have been her husband!). But, needless to say, all this is very speculative, and no more than a working hypothesis.

3 *Τιάρης*. The name appears to be new. But cf. P. Ryl. IV 683.1 (244) *Τιῶρις*.

N. GONIS

### 4615. LEASE OF LAND

56 1B.25/55 (a)

22 × 11.2 cm

3 September 505

The lessor in this document is Flavius Strategius I, but the chief point of interest is the mention of his father, Apion I, in the capacity of former praetorian prefect. Apion’s tenure of this office was hitherto known only from the literary sources: see below 4–5 n.

The papyrus breaks off just before the object of the lease was stated; to judge from the wording, this was probably a *μηχανή*, literally an irrigation machine, but in this context an artificially irrigated unit of cultivation. For this class of documents see the introductions to



LV **3803**, LVIII **3955**, LXIII **4390**; a further new example is P. Palau Rib. inv. 24 (502/3) (ed. S. Daris, *Emerita* 64 (1996) 291).

The number of land leases in the ‘Apion archive’ is extremely small. J. Gascou, *T&MByz* 9 (1985) 9 n. 29 knew of only two instances, P. Flor. III 325 and XVI **1968**, both of which he regarded as doubtful—but the Apion connection of P. Flor. 325 has now been established; see **4614** 1 n. There have since been two accretions: LXIII **4390** (469), which features Flavia Isis, a daughter of Fl. Strategius, *comes consistorii*, and **4615**. We may also note that the number of Oxyrhynchite land-leases of the Byzantine period is a mere fraction of the figures available from the Arsinoite or Hermopolite regions; the phenomenon is further discussed in *Tyche* 15 (2000) (forthcoming).

A further interesting detail is that this is the first land lease in which the lessee is stated to be an *ἐναπόγραφος γεωργός*.

The script closely resembles, but is probably not the same as, that of XLVII **3355** (535).

The back, to the extent that it survives, is blank.

χμγ

[† ὑπα]τεία Φλ(αουίων) Καβ(ιν)ιανου καὶ Θεοδώρου τῶν ἐνδοξοτάτων Θῶθ  
 ς // ἰνδ(ικτίωνος) ἰδ.  
 [Φλ]αουίων Στρατηγίω τῷ μεγαλοπρεπεστάτῳ καὶ ἐνδοξοτάτῳ κόμετι  
 τῶν καθοσιωμένων  
 [δομ]εστικῶν υἱῷ τοῦ <τὰ> πάντα πανευφήμου καὶ ὑπερφουεστάτου ἀπὸ  
 ὑπάτων καὶ ἐπάρχων  
 5 [ c. 7 ] υ [A]πίων[ος] γεουχοῦντι ἐν τῇ λαμπρᾷ καὶ λαμπροτάτῃ  
 Ὁξυρυγχιτῶν πόλει.  
 [Aὐρήλιος c. 6 ] .ος υἱὸς Πατενυφίου μητρὸς Θεοδοσίας ἐναπόγραφος  
 γεωργὸς τῆς  
 [ὑμῶν μεγαλοπρεπ]είας ὀρμώμενος ἐκ τοῦ αὐτῆς κτήματος καλουμένου  
 Μονίμου  
 [τοῦ Ὁξυρυγχιτο]υ νομοῦ χαίρειν. ὁμολογῶ παρειληφέναι παρὰ τῆς ἡμῶν  
 [μεγαλοπρεπείας καὶ] μεμισθῶσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος ἔτους ρπβ ρνα τῆς  
 10 [παρούσης τεσσαρε]ςκαιδεκάτης ἰνδικτίωνος ἐπορᾶς καὶ συνκομιζῆς  
 καρπῶν  
 [τῆς σὺν θεῷ πεντ]εκαιδεκάτης ἐπινεμήσεως ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων  
 [τῆ ὑμῶν μεγαλοπρεπ]ε[ία] διακειμένων ἐμ πεδίοις τοῦ ὑμετέρου  
 κτήματος  
 ]ης[ . . . . . ] .νω[ . . . . . ] . . . . .

2 φλλ) ἰνΔ 3 I. καθωσιωμένων 4 υῖω ὑπερφνεστατου ὑπατων 6 υῖος  
 8 I. ὑμών 10 ἰνδικτιονος 1. συγκομδῆς 11 ὑπαρχοντων 12 I. ἐν

‘In the consulship of Flavii Sabinianus and Theodorus, *viri gloriosissimi*, Thoth 6, indication 14.

‘To Flavius Strategius, *magnificentissimus et gloriosissimus comes devotissimorum domesticorum*, son of the in all matters most renowned and most extraordinary consular and former prefect . . . Apion, landowner in the splendid and most splendid city of the Oxyrhynchites, [Aurelius] . . . os, son of Patenuphis, mother Theodosia, registered farmer of your magnificence, originating from your possession called Monimu of the Oxyrhynchite nome, greetings. I acknowledge that I have received from your [magnificence and] taken on lease from the present year 182/151 of the current fourteenth indiction, for the sowing and the collection of crops of the [God willing] fifteenth epinemesis, from the property belonging to your magnificence situated in the territory of your possession . . .’

1 χμγ. On this Christian symbol of disputed significance see most recently P. Hamb. IV 266.1 n. with references. Its earliest attestation seems to be P. Kell. IV 96.1 (= *The Kellis Account Book*), dating from 361–64 or 376–79. Cf. also A. Di Bitonto Kasser, *Aegyptus* 78 (1998) 123–29.

2 For the conversion of the date see R. S. Bagnall and K. A. Worp, *The Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt* 85, 96. For the consulship see R. S. Bagnall et al., *Consuls of the Later Roman Empire* 545, and P. Heid. V 357 introd.

3–4 Strategius has the same titulature in XVI 1982, of 497, and P. Harr. inv. 550a (see 4614 introd.), of 503/518. In CPR XIV 48.2 (506), which has *στ]ρατηγίω τῷ μεγαλοπρεπεστάτ(ω) καὶ ἐνδοξοτ[άτ(ω)*, it is possible that *κόμετι τῶν καθωσιωμένων δομestikῶν*, probably abbreviated, followed in the break.

*μεγαλοπρεπεστάτ(ω) καὶ ἐνδοξοτάτ(ω)*. For the epithets see R. Delmaire, *Byzantion* 54 (1984) 157–61.

*κόμετι τῶν καθωσιωμένων [δομ]ετικῶν*. On this office, titular by this time, see Delmaire, loc. cit. 148–53, 175, and B. Palme, *Eirene* 34 (1998) 104–16, citing further literature on p. 110 n. 29. The conferring of the *comitiva domesticorum* raised someone to the rank of *vir illustris*, and so enabled him to be a member of the senate. The *comitiva* is intimately connected with state or imperial service, especially in the East. On present evidence, Strategius’ *comitiva* seems to have had no link with the tenure of a public office. We should also bear in mind that he must have been young, cf. 4614 2 n. But ‘illustrious fathers naturally petitioned the emperor to give the same rank to their sons, and the emperor was gracious to youths of illustrious parentage’ (A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire* ii. 529). This may well apply to Apion I and Strategius too. We know of two other young *comites domesticorum*, but both were consuls: Venantius (cos. 507), and Apion II (cos. 539); this may have been the case with the consuls of 527 and 541 too.

4–5 The titles and offices of Apion I in the papyri may be presented in chronological order:

P. Flor. III 325 (Oxy.; 20.5.489)	ὑπερ[φνεστάτου
SB XVIII 13953 (Hera.; 17.6.492)	ἐνδοξοτάτου καὶ ὑπερφνεστάτου
SPP XX 129 (Hera.; 4.2.497)	ἐνδοξ(οτάτου) καὶ ὑπερφνεστάτου ἀπὸ ὑπάτων
XVI 1982 (Oxy.; 1.10.497)	ὑπερφνεστάτου καὶ πανευφήμου ἀπὸ ὑπάτων
LXVII 4615 (Oxy.; 3.9.505)	πανευφήμου καὶ ὑπερφνεστάτου ἀπὸ ὑπάτων καὶ ἐπάρχων [

J. R. Martindale, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* ii. 111 has suggested that Apion ‘presumably acquired the consulship between 492 and 497’. This relies on the lack of a reference to the office in SB VI 9152 = XVIII 13953. But I doubt whether this is conclusive, since his epithets there, *ἐνδοξότατος καὶ ὑπερφνεστάτος*, could well apply to a man of consular rank, cf. SPP XX 129.2 (cited above); compare also the case of his son Strategius in 4616 and elsewhere (see 4616 2–3 n.), who is styled *ἐνδοξότατος καὶ ὑπερφνεστάτος magister militum*

and *ex consulibus*. (In P. Flor. 325.2–3 Hornickel, *Ehren- und Rangbrädikate* 11 n. 2, restored τοῦ ὑπερ[φ]υεστάτου ἀπὸ ὑπάτ(ων) Ἀ[π]ίωνο[ς], but this is not certain.)

The texts listed above may be taken to suggest that in the course of 497 there was a change in Apion's titlature, with the epithet ἐνδοξότατος being replaced by πανεύφημος. This might represent an increase in dignity, but no further titles are mentioned, and the details are obscure. However, it is perhaps more likely that the change simply reflects local variations of the formulaic protocol, Heracleopolis as against Oxyrhynchus; for a somewhat similar case concerning the titlature of Strategius Paneuphemos see B. Palme, *Chiron* 27 (1998) 101.

4 ἀπὸ ὑπάτων καὶ ἐπάρχων. This is the first occurrence of the collocation in papyri.

ἀπὸ ὑπάτων. For the honorary consulship see Jones, op. cit. 533.

ἀπὸ . . . ἐπάρχων. Cf. John Malalas, *Chron.* (SHB) 398 καὶ ἐπεστράτευσεν κατὰ Περσῶν ὁ αὐτὸς Ἀναστάσιος βασιλεὺς, πέμψας . . . καὶ τὸν πατρικίον Ἀππίωνα, ποιήσας αὐτὸν ἑπαρχὸν τῶν πραιτωρίων Ἀνατολῆς. Apion probably was *praefectus praetorio Orientis vacans*, and in this capacity in charge of the army supplies in Anastasius' abortive Persian campaign of 503; see E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire* ii. 95 n. 2, 783; E. R. Hardy, *DOP* 22 (1968) 29; Martindale, *PLRE* ii. 111; J. Gascou, *T&MB* 9 (1985) 62 n. 344; G. Greatrex, *Rome and Persia at War, 502–32* (1998) 96, 109. He was out of office in May 504 (see Gascou, op. cit. 62 with nn. 345–6), that is, more than a year before the date of our papyrus. (He had a brief spell as PPO *in actu* shortly after his return from exile in 518.)

It may be useful to note that **4615** confirms the identity of the Apion and Strategius of XVI **1982** with those attested in the literary sources, in view of the two separate entries in *PLRE*: Apion 1 and 2 (ii 110–11), and Strategius 8 and 9 (ii 1034–36). The distinction has already been contested by Gascou, op. cit. 61 n. 343, 63 n. 355, but is maintained by R. Delmaire, *Les responsables des finances impériales au Bas-Empire romain* (1989) 262. It is clear that the Apion and Strategius of XVI **1982** are the same men as those of **4615**, while the latter two are the same as the father and the son who held senior administrative posts later.

5 I am not sure how to restore the lacuna at the start of the line. [πραιτωρίο]ν seems unlikely: it is rather long for the space, and in papyri and inscriptions former or honorary praetorian prefects are usually styled as ἀπὸ ἐπάρχων only — ICret. 317.3–4, 318.3–4 (both 381–4) ἀπὸ ὑπάτων καὶ ἀπὸ ἐπάρχων πραιτωρίου (-ίων) appear to be exceptions. A supplement [Φλαουῖο]ν likewise has few attractions, given that Apion's *gentilicium* is not mentioned at this point in XVI **1982** 5. A possibility which ought to be considered is [πατρικίο]ν; Apion was *patricius* at this date; cf. the passage from Malalas cited above.

γεουχοῦντι ἐν τῇ . . . Ὀξυρρυχιδῶν πόλει. See **4616** 3–4 n.

6 Πατενυφίου. The name, a version of the relatively common Petenuphis, is not attested elsewhere in this form. For the interchange of *a* and *e* in unaccented syllables see F. T. Gignac, *Grammar* i. 279.

ἐναπόγραφος γεωργός. See J.-M. Carrié, *Atti XVII Int. Cong. Pap.* (1984) 939–48; I. F. Fikhman, *AnPap* 3 (1991) 7–17; J. Banaji in A. K. Bowman and E. Rogan (eds.), *Agriculture in Egypt from Pharaonic to Modern Times = PBA* 96 (1999) 206 ff. The term is also discussed by many of the contributors to E. Lo Cascio (ed.), *Terre, proprietari e contadini dell'impero romano: dall'affitto agrario al colonato tardoantico* (1997). See also **4616** 7 n.

7 τοῦ αὐτῆς κτήματος καλουμένου Μονίμου. Until the end of the third century Monimu is attested as an ἐποίκιον situated in the upper toparchy, see P. Pruneti, *I centri abitati dell'Ossirinchi* (1981) 107. Thereafter it disappears from the papyri until it resurfaces in the sixth century. Here it is said to be part of the Apion holdings, but in XVI **2020** 14, a text assigned to the 580s (see Gascou, op. cit. 48), it appears to be under the *domus divina*. If we are dealing with the same locality, it would seem that in the time that separates the two documents *Μονίμου* passed from the *domus gloriosa* of the Apions to the imperial *domus divina*: a change of ownership, or one of fiscal responsibility? In this context, it may be worth recalling the definition of κτήμα in P. Wash. Univ. I 25.7–8 (530): κτήμα(τος) τῆς ὑμῶν μεγαλοπρεπείας | ἦτ[οι] τοῦ αὐτῆς μέρους τούτο[υ] τοῦ Ὀξυρρυχίτου νομοῦ; for the significance of the terms μερίδες, μέρη, μοίραι, and their connection with liturgical and fiscal duties, see Gascou, op. cit. 40 ff., and J. Gascou and P. J. Sijpesteijn, *ZPE* 97 (1993) 119–21. Whichever may be the case, the phenomenon is not isolated in the Oxyrhynchite documentation of the period; see Gascou, op. cit. 77 (note on XXVII **2479**). Another such example is perhaps to be seen in the μηχανή called Τοῦ Λάκκου: assuming that the reference is to the same irrigated farm, we see it under the *domus divina* around 549 (P. Col. inv. 83, ed. *ZPE* 120 (1998) 124), but apparently under the Apions a few decades later (LXVI **4537**).

Although Monimu is not described as an *ἐποίκιον* here, there is no reason to assume that it was not one; in such contexts the terms *κτῆμα* and *ἐποίκιον* are equivalent: see E. R. Hardy, *The Large Estates of Byzantine Egypt* (1931) 132–3, and I. F. Fikhman, *Oxirinkh—gorod papyrusov* (1976) 72 n. 84.

8–9 *ὁμολογῶ παρειληφέναι . . . μεμικθῶσθαι*. The clause is relatively rare. I have found it with the infinitives in the reverse order in P. Abinn. 63.18 (350); P. Wash. Univ. I 17.10–11 (514); P. Bad. VI 172.9–10 (547); and it may be restored in P. Lond. V 1797.9–10 (516, cf. BL VII 92) *ὁμολογῶ παρειληφέναι π[α]ρὰ τῆς | [τῆς σοφίας καὶ μεμικθ]ῶσθαι* (. . . .] *σθαι* ed. pr.).

9 Oxyrhynchite era year 182/151 corresponds to 505/6; see Bagnall and Worp, *Chronological Systems* 85.

10 *σποράς καὶ συνκομιζῆς* (l. -δῆς) *καρπῶν*. At this point earlier texts have *σποράς* alone: P. Mich. XI 611.7 (412), P. Oslo II 35.10 (426), VI 913 8 (443), LXIII 4390 7 (469) (LV 3803 10 (411) is broken at this point). P. Flor. III 325.6 (489) offers *συλλογῆς καρπῶν*, while P. Berl. Zill. 7.10–11 (574) has *κατασποράς δὲ καὶ | συλλογῆς καρπῶν. συνκομιζῆς* (l. -δῆς). For the interchange δ > ζ see Gignac, *Grammar* i. 76.

10–11 In conformity with the Oxyrhynchite pattern, the lease is to start in autumn, but the crops (and the taxes) are calculated on the basis of the *praedelegatio*, beginning 1 May, see Bagnall and Worp, op. cit. 26–7. A further example occurs in the recently published P. Palau Rib. inv. 24. Lines 2–3 of that text were edited thus:

ἔτους] ροθ ρμη τῆ[ε πα]ρούσης δε[κάτης ἰνδικτίονος  
]της ἐπνεμῆ[σεως] τὰς δ[ιαφερούσας

The editor notes that year 179/148 (= 502/3) coincides with an eleventh indiction and not with the tenth mentioned in the papyrus, and refers to a similar discrepancy in XVI 1986 = SB XII 11231, of 549, where, however, the number of the following *epinemesis* is correct. If the era year is correct (which is likely; cf. R. S. Bagnall and K. A. Worp, *BASP* 17 (1980) 21), and the scribe wrote the right figure for the *epinemesis*, we may reconstruct lines 2–3 as follows (the line division is *exempli gratia*):

ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος ἔτους] ροθ ρμη τῆ[ε πα]ρούσης δε[κάτης ἰνδικτίωνος, σποράς καὶ  
συλλογῆς καρπῶν τῆς σὺν θεῷ δωδεκά]της ἐπνεμῆ[σεως] τὰς δ[ιαφερούσας

11 [τῆς σὺν θεῷ πεντ]εκαδεκάτης ἐπνεμῆσεως. Oxyrhynchite documents usually refer to the coming indiction as ἡ σὺν θεῷ ἰνδικτίων or ἐπνεμῆσις. A construction with the participle *εἰσιούσα*, common elsewhere in Egypt, is rare in this region; I have found it only in XVI 1970 26 (554), I 126 10 (572) (with *σὺν θεῷ*), and XVI 1892 21 (581) (see also (Korr. Tyche 261), *Tyche* 13 (1998) 263).

11–12 Cf. P. Flor. III 325.10 (489) ] ἐν πεδίοις τοῦ αὐτοῦ κτήματος ὀλόκληρον μηχανὴν καλουμένην (perhaps supply *διακειμένων* in the lacuna before ἐν). Cf. also LV 3803 5 (411), LXIII 4390 9–10 (469), SB XX 15027.3 (475).

N. GONIS

#### 4616. RECEIPT FOR PART OF AN IRRIGATION MACHINE

54 1B.25(B)/A(1)b

12. 5 × 10.3 cm

30 September 525

The top and parts of nine lines of a document of a well-attested type; for an up-to-date list see L. E. Tacoma, *ZPE* 120 (1998) 128f. The papyrus breaks off just before the details of the receipt were stated.

**4616** is only the second text from the period between Strategius' tenure of the *comitatus domesticorum* and his patriciate, and confirms the dating of XVI 1984 to 523. A further point of interest is the occurrence of a simple *γεωργός* in place of the expected *ἐναπόγραφος γεωργός*; see further 7–8 n.

The text is written along the fibres. What survives of the back is blank, but such

a document would have had an endorsement, now lost along with the beginnings of the lines. There is a sheet join running vertically about 1 cm from the right hand edge.

[† ὑπατείας Φλαουίου Φιλ]οξένο[υ] τ[οῦ] λ[α]μπροτάτου, Φαῶφι γ  
ἰνδ(ικτίωνος) δ.

[Φλαουίω Στρατηγίω τ]ῷ ἔνδοξοτάτῳ καὶ ὑπερφυστάτῳ στρατηλάτῃ  
[καὶ ἀπὸ ὑπάτων γεου]χοῦντι καὶ ἐνταῦθα τῇ λαμπρᾷ Ὀξυρυγχιτῶν  
[πόλει διὰ Μηνᾶ οἰκέτου] τοῦ καὶ ἐπερωτῶντος καὶ προσπορίζοντος  
5 [τῷ ἰδίῳ αὐτοῦ δεσπότη τ]ῷ αὐτῷ ἔνδοξοτάτῳ ἀνδρὶ τὴν ἀγωγὴν  
[καὶ ἐνοχὴν Αὐρήλιο]ς Βίκτωρ υἱὸς Ἰσὰκ μητρὸς Μάρθας  
[ἀπὸ c. 10 ] βορρινῆς τοῦ Ὀξυρυγχίτου νομοῦ γεωργός  
[τῆς ὑμῶν ἔνδοξο]τήτος χαίρειν. χρείας καὶ νῦν γενναμένης  
[εἰς τὴν ὑπ' ἐμὲ γεουχι]κῆ[ν μ]η[χαν]ῆ[ν] κ[α]λομε[ν]η[ν] .]ο. .ε. [. .]υ

1 φαωφῖ ἰνδ 2 ὑπερφυστατω 6 υἱος ἰσακ

'In the consulship of Flavius Philoxenus, *vir clarissimus*, Phaophi 3, indiction 4.

'To Flavius Strategius, the most glorious and most extraordinary *magister militum* and consular, landowner here also in the splendid city of the Oxyrhynchites, through Menas, slave, putting the formal question and supplying for his own master, the same most glorious man, the conduct of and responsibility for (the transaction), Aurelius Victor, son of Isak, mother Martha, from the northern . . . of the Oxyrhynchite nome, farmer of your gloriousness, greeting. Since now too a need has arisen for . . . in the estate irrigator under my charge . . .'

1 For the conversion of the date see R. S. Bagnall and K. A. Worp, *The Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt* 86, 96. For the consulate see R. S. Bagnall et al., *Consuls of the Later Roman Empire* 585, with R. W. Burgess, *Phoenix* 43 (1989) 156; also R. Pintaudi, P. J. Sijpesteijn, *AnPap* 6 (1994) 145.

2-3 [Φλαουίω Στρατηγίω τ]ῷ ἔνδοξοτάτῳ καὶ ὑπερφυστάτῳ στρατηλάτῃ [καὶ ἀπὸ ὑπάτων. Strategius' name and titulature are restored after XVI 1984 2-3 (523); cf. also the protocol XVI 1928, of 533 (for the date see J. Gascou, *Tyche* 9 (1994) 19-21). The titles of *magister militum* (see Gascou, *T&MByz* 9 (1985) 64 n. 362, and the literature assembled by R. Mazza, *Aegyptus* 75 (1995) 210 n. 133) and *ex consulibus* were honorary, but ranked above the *comitiva domesticorum*, which Strategius held earlier; see A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire* i. 372, ii. 528, 636. The different status of the titles is also evident from his honorific epithets: *μεγαλοπρεπέστατος καὶ ἔνδοξοτάτος* earlier, now *ἔνδοξοτάτος καὶ ὑπερφυστάτος*. When this promotion took place is unknown; it is also unclear whether it has anything to do with his tenure of the office of *praefectus Augustalis* shortly before 524: see Gascou, *T&MByz* 9 (1985) 64 with n. 358. A further promotion was to follow: Strategius was *patricius* by 30 December 530; cf. XXXVI 2779.

A separate note on XVI 1984 may be appended here. Ed. pr. dated it to '523 (?)', reading the consular date clause in line 1 as ὑπατείας Φλ[αου]ί[ο]υ [? Ἰωάννο]υ τοῦ λαμπροτάτου Φ[α]ῶφι λ ἰνδικ(τίωνος) β. P. J. Sijpesteijn, K. A. Worp, *ZPE* 26 (1977) 276 n. 28 (= BL VII 143), noticed the discrepancy between the year and the consul's name: the consul of 523 was Fl. Maximus, whereas John (the Cappadocian) was the consul of 538. Bagnall and

Worp, op. cit. 122, include the text among the instances of the consulship of Maximus, without further comment. This has been confirmed on the original, on which I read the name of the consul as Φλ[(αοῦου)] Μᾶξίμου.

3–4 γεου]χοῦντι καὶ ἐνταῦθα τῇ λαμπρᾷ Ὀξυρρυχιτῶν [πόλει. Strategius is first said to own land *also* in Oxyrhynchus in XVI **1984** 3–4 (523). But contrast P. Flor. III 325.3 (489), XVI **1982** 5 (497), **4615** 5 (505), where he is styled γεουχοῦντι ἐν (ἐνταῦθα in **1982**) τῇ λαμπρᾷ καὶ λαμπροτάτῃ Ὀξυρρυχιτῶν πόλει, a formulation indicating landownership *only* in Oxyrhynchus. Clearly, some time between 505 and 523 Strategius was established as a landowner also beyond the territory of Oxyrhynchus. We know that the *oikos* of Apion I, Strategius' father, is attested exclusively in Heracleopolis; cf. SB XVIII 13953 (492), SPP XX 129 (497), VIII 772 (V), CPR V 17 (late V) (it is uncertain whether the Oxyrhynchite *defensor civitatis* of XVI **1886** is Apion I); and that from 530 onwards Strategius is described as *πρωτεύων* in Heracleopolis and Oxyrhynchus; cf. XXXVI **2779** 3–4 (530), XVI **1983** 3–4 (535). It is likely, therefore, that by 523 Strategius had assumed control over the Heracleopolite *oikos* of his father. This seems to have taken place during the latter's lifetime: Apion I is thought to have died between 524 and 532; see Gasco, *T&MByz* 9 (1985) 63 with n. 352. The period of Apion's exile, 510–18, seems a good time for this; in fact we have no evidence that Apion's fall from Anastasius' favour affected Strategius. But we may also consider the possibility whether the administration of the Heracleopolite part of the estate was devolved on Strategius at a time when more pressing business kept Apion away. The case of the Oxyrhynchite *oikos*, which seems to have been in Strategius' control already by 489 (cf. P. Flor. III 325), or at least by 497 (cf. **1982**), would have served as a parallel, provided of course that earlier the *oikos* was controlled by Apion; cf. **4514** 2 n.

In this context, I am not sure how much weight one should attach to CPR XIV 48, of 506, which shows Strategius in the capacity of *riparius* at Heracleopolis. The ripariate was a *munus patrimonii* which fell upon the local *oikoi*, cf. XVI **2039**. On present evidence there is no way of knowing whether in 506 Strategius was the actual head of the Heracleopolite *oikos*, or discharged the *munus* on behalf of his father.

4–6 διὰ . . . ἐνοχῆν. The clause has turned up only in texts related to the Apion family. Its first instance, although in slightly different wording, is in LXIII **4390** 4–5, of 469; it occurs again in XVI **1984** 4–6, of 523; see below 4 n.

In his comment on the clause I. F. Fikhman, in R. Pintaudi (ed.), *Miscellanea Papyrologica* = Pap. Flor. VII (1980) 71 n. l. 4, wrote: 'C'est la formule habituelle dans les documents des Apions qui leur sont adressés en qualité de personnes privées, c'est pourquoi elle manque dans SB VI 9152 (Héracléopolis, 492) et P. Vars. 30 (571).' This distinction does not seem to apply to the earlier texts from Oxyrhynchus. XVI **1982** (497), **1984** (523) and **4616** (525) are all documents of the same kind addressed to Fl. Strategius I, but **1982** does not have the formula. In **4615**, of 505, which also lacks the clause, Strategius I appears to be as much of a *personne privée* as in the texts which contain it. The only difference I can see is that the formula only occurs in those texts where the representatives of the family are said to own land 'also in Oxyrhynchus'. It is also significant that Menas' earliest occurrence in a papyrus (see next note) coincides with the first mention of Strategius I as landowner 'also in Oxyrhynchus'; see above 3–4 n.

That in the earlier texts Strategius appears without intermediaries deserves notice for one further reason. In a note commenting on the case of the count Fl. Phoebammon alias Lamason in P. Wash. Univ. I 25, who appears to possess land exclusively in Oxyrhynchus, Fikhman observed that the fact that the count is addressed directly without an intermediary indicates the absence of a central administrative apparatus, which may suggest that his estate was of modest size (MNHMH *G. A. Petropoulos* (1984) i. 382). If this applies to Strategius too, one of the implications would be that at the end of the fifth century and the beginning of the sixth the size of the Apion holdings was not what it came to be later.

4 [Μηνᾶ οἰκέτου]. On Menas see LVIII **3935** 7 n. para. 3. He first appears in XVI **1984** 4–6, of 523; on the original I read διὰ Μηνᾶ οἰκέτου τοῦ καὶ ἐπερωτῶντος καὶ προσ|πορίζοντος τῷ ἰδίῳ δεσπ[ότ]ῃ τῷ αὐτῷ ὑπερφ[υ] ἐστάτῳ ἀνδρὶ | τὴν ἀγωγὴν καὶ ἐνοχῆν (this part of the text was not transcribed in ed. pr.).

Outside the 'Apion archive' there is only one document attesting an intermediary who is also an οἰκέτης, P. Col. inv. 83.11–13 (ZPE 120 (1998) 124), of 549 (?), a text of the same type as **4616** and addressed to the *curatores* of the *domus divina* of Justinian διὰ | Ἀπφουᾶ [οἰ]κέτου καὶ μειζοτέρου τοῦ αὐτοῦ θειοτάτου | οἴκου; the absence of a *gentilicium* from Apphusas' name is noticeable.

5 [τῷ ἰδίῳ αὐτοῦ δεσπότη τ]ῷ. The restored αὐτοῦ has no exact parallel, but one could compare LXIII **4397** 13 (545) τῷ [αὐτῷ ὅ]περ φνεστάτω αὐτοῦ δεσπότη.

7 βορρυνῆς is part of the place-name stated to be Victor's *origo*. The existing topographical repertories record nothing similar. For the formation compare the Oxyrhynchite ἐποίκιον Παρορίου νοτίης; cf. also the Heracleopolite Τοκάις βορρυνή (SB XX 14580.1), or the Arsinoite Οὐὼ βορρυνή. There is no means of telling whether it was a κώμη or an ἐποίκιον.

7–8 γεωργός [τῆς ὑμῶν ἐνδοξό]τητος. Victor is not styled as ἐναπόγραφος γεωργός. It is doubtful whether the absence of the term ἐναπόγραφος is a simple scribal omission. There is no reference to Victor's *origo* as being a possession of Strategius, which is the rule with ἐναπόγραφοι (VI **996** = SB XVI 12484.7 (584) is not an exception, as the text makes it clear that the ἐποίκιον Εὐτυχιάδος is a κτήμα of the Apions; cf. Fikhman, Pap. Flor. VII p. 74 n. l. 7). Although the construction recalls XVI **1915** 18 (c. 560) τοῖς ἐξῆς γεωργοῖς τοῦ ἐνδοξ(ου) οἴκου, XIX **2239** 13 (598) τοῖς πάντα γεωργοῖς τῆς ὑμετέρας ἐνδοξ(ότητος), or PSI VII 823.6 (V) Κάρπον τὸν γεωργὸν τοῦ ἐν ὑμῶν δεσπότη(ν) μο(ν), it is difficult to be sure whether these examples do not refer to ἐναπόγραφοι. As Fikhman, *AnPap* 3 (1991) 10, has pointed out, the term occurs only 'dans les documents adressés par des colons [i.e. the ἐναπόγραφοι] ou leurs représentants . . . aux grands propriétaires respectifs'; but this is not the case with the examples cited. Victor, I suppose, was an agricultural worker on the estate of Strategius. Such γεωργοί are attested already in the Roman period, but they occur more often from the fourth century onwards: cf., e.g., XII **1424** 4 (c. 318), LXVI **4528** 9 (336); we may also compare P. Köln III 152.7 (477?) γεωργός τῆς [α]ὐτῆς ἀγίας ἐκκλησίας. They may be recognized in the class of γεωργοί distinguished from ἐναπόγραφοι in Justinian's *Novella* 128.14, of 545: γεωργοὺς τιμὴ προσήκοντα ἢ ἐναπογράφους.

Most of the receipts for replacement parts of irrigation machinery in the Apion archive refer to ἐναπόγραφοι; only XVI **1987** (587) features an ἀντέδικος (for the term see D. Bonneau, *Proc. XII Int. Cong. Pap.* (1970) 55 n. 87), who is a native of Oxyrhynchus.

8 ἐνδοξό]τητος is inevitable, and becomes the earliest occurrence of the abstract noun, equivalent to Latin *gloria*, in a papyrus. P. Koch, *Die byzantinischen Beamtentitel von 400 bis 700* (1903) 115, notes that it first appears in the legal sources in 533. (There is no reason to assume that it was used in SB XVIII 13951 (487–91), a text addressed to the *comes domesticorum* Fl. Eustochius: in lines 6 and 8 restore μεγαλοπρεπείας in place of ἐνδοξότητος, and in 11 μεγαλοπρεπεία instead of ἐνδοξότητι; cf. XVI **1982** 10, 12 and **4615** 7, 12, which refer to Strategius I, also a *comes domesticorum*.)

9 .]ρ. . ε. [.]ν. I have not been able to match the traces with any of the known names of μηχαναί.

N. GONIS

#### 4617. LIST OF FESTAL PAYMENTS

84/60

12.5 × 20.5, 12.5 × 6 cm

Fifth century  
Plate XI

This list entitled γυνῶς(ις) ἑορτικ(ῶν) contains the names of fifteen churches and one monastery followed by amounts in money. Most of the churches were already known: see the list given by L. Antonini in *Aegyptus* 20 (1940) 172–83; cf. also S. Timm, *Das christlich-koptische Ägypten* i (Wiesbaden, 1984) 283–300. Several are attested in XI **1357**, recently re-edited by A. Papaconstantinou in *REByz* 54 (1996) 135–59. On contributions to and from churches see E. Wipszycka, *Les ressources et les activités économiques des églises* (Pap. Brux. 10; 1972), chaps. 3 and 4, and in G. Cavallo et al. (edd.), *Scrivere libri e documenti nel mondo antico* (Pap. Flor. XXX; 1998) 71–2. The closest parallels to **4617** are PSI VII 791, re-edited by Wipszycka, 123–4, and SB XIV 12130, both from the Oxyrhynchite nome. PSI 791 begins



with the heading *γνώσις χρυσ(οῦ) παρεχομ(ένου) τῷ θεοφιλ(εστάτῳ) ἐπισκ(όπῳ) ὑ(πέρ) τῶν δύο ἑορτ(ῶν) κ(ατά) Θῶθ και Τῦβι ἰνδ(ικτίονος) θ* (so the ed. pr. and Wipszycka, but in view of **4617** and SB 12130, see below, one wonders whether *ἑορτ(ι)κ(ῶν)* is preferable to *ἑορτ(ῶν) κ(ατά)*). It records contributions in money from (*παρά*) various churches and monasteries to the bishop for feasts or *ἑορτικά* in the two months specified, for the day of St Philoxenus, for *ἑορταστική*, and for a feast in Pharmuthi. SB XIV 12130 is headed *λόγ(ος) ἑορτικ(ῶν) Φαρμούθι ια/ ἰνδ(ικτίωνος)*; later it refers to *ἑορτικά* for Tybi and Pharmuthi of the 12th indiction. It consists of a list of money payments *π(αρά) τῶν ἀπό* followed by place-names.

It seems very likely that **4617** is a similar account of payments due from the churches and monastery listed, an interpretation which is supported by *χρεω*[ in line 2 (see the note). It is less likely that **4617** is a list of churches receiving money, although we know that large landowners, e.g. the Apion family, did make regular contributions to religious establishments; see E. R. Hardy, *The Large Estates of Byzantine Egypt* (New York 1931) 140–4. *ἑορτικά* are often attested with reference to extra payments made by lessees to lessors (e.g. XVI **1890** 12, LVIII **3955** 19), but these never concern religious establishments. We do find churches mentioned alongside *ἑορτικά* in a few documents, notably VI **993**, XVI **1950**, **1951**, XXVII **2480** recto v 96, and SB X 10560, first published by Wipzycka in *Chr. d'Ég.* 43 (1968) 344–9; but these all involve a single church giving *ἑορτικά*, usually to workmen. No list of churches receiving *ἑορτικά* has yet been published. Note also the absence of the term *προσφορά*, which is usually found in connection with donations to religious establishments (cf. Hardy, 143, and **4620**).

The handwriting of **4617** is similar to that of Schubart, *P. Gr. Berol.* 42b (AD 441) and to Seider, *Paläographie* i. 50 (AD 426 or 441), which suggests it was written in the fifth century. Lines 17–20 are on a separate fragment. The back is blank.

	† γνώσις(ις) ἑορτικ(ῶν) οὕ(τως)	
		χρεω[
/	ἐκκλ(ησία) νοτίν(η)	(δηναρίων) (μυριάδες) [
	ἐκκλ(ησία) Μαρτυρίου	(δηναρίων) (μυριάδες) [
5	ἐκκλ(ησία) Παρά Ποταμ(όν)	(δηναρίων) (μυριάδες) [
	τοῦ ἀγί(ου) Σεφάνου	(δηναρίων) (μυριάδες) [
	τοῦ ἀγί(ου) Ἰούστου	(δηναρίων) (μυριάδες) [
	τοῦ ἀγί(ου) Ἰωάννου Βαπτ(ιστοῦ)	(δηναρίων) [
	τοῦ ἀγί(ου) Μηνᾶ	(δηναρίων) (μυριάδες) [
10	τῆς ἀγί(ας) Θέκλας	vac. [
	τῆς ἀγί(ας) Εὐφημίας	(δηναρίων) (μυριάδες) [
	τοῦ ἀγί(ου) Νίλου	[
	τοῦ ἀγί(ου) Β[ίκ]τορος	(δηναρίων) [



	μον(αετήριον) Α[α]μάωνος	(δηναρίων) (μυριάδες) [
15	τῆς ἀγί(α)ς Μ[	
	τοῦ ἀγί(ου) Γαβ[ριήλ	
	.	.
	.	.
	[ c. 6 ] . . . . . [	
	τ[οῦ ἀγί(ου) Φιλοξένου	(δηναρίων) (μυριάδες) [
	τοῦ ἀγί(ου) Ἰουλιανού	(δηναρίων) (μυριάδες) [
20	[ c. 6 ] . [	
	.	.

1 γρως εορτικῶ 3 εκκλ, so 4, 5 νοτις χ and so passim 5 ποταμῆ 6 αγε, and so  
 passim 7 ἰουετου 8 ἰωαννουβαπτῆ 14 μονς 19 ἰουλιανου

‘List of festal payments, as follows:  
 still outstanding (?):

South Church	(den. myr.) [
Church of Martyrius	(den. myr.) [
Church by the River	(den. myr.) [
St Stephanus	(den. myr.) [
St Justus	(den. myr.) [
St John the Baptist	(den.) [
St Menas	(den. myr.) [
St Thecla	
St Euphemia	(den. myr.) [
St Nilus	[
St Victor	(den.) [
Monastery of Lamason	(den. myr.) [
St Mary (?) [	
St Gabriel [	
. . . . .	
St Philoxenus	(den. myr.) [
St Julianus	(den. myr.) [
. . . . .	

1 *έορτικ(ών)*: both the singular (*έορτικόν*) and the plural (*έορτικά*) are found. In her article cited from *Chr. d'Ég.* Wipszycka wishes to expand the singular in all the texts to which she refers, but this is unlikely to be correct. The plural seems more appropriate here, as contributions from several churches are listed. In PSI 791 the *έορταστική* is not connected with a specific feast, and Wipszycka, *Les ressources* 124f., suggested seeing in it a contribution given every Sunday from the churches to the bishop. The *έορτικά* in **4617** are not stated to be for any

particular feast and may perhaps also be weekly contributions to the episcopal fund (the adjectives *έορταστικός* and *έορτικός* can be assumed to be synonymous; see Lampe, *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, s.vv.). For a list of *έορταί* attested in the papyri see L. Casarico, *Aegyptus* 64 (1984) 135–62.

2 *χρεω[*: this is written in between lines 1 and 3, but the writer may have intended it to go with line 1. The last two letters are slightly raised, which may or may not indicate an abbreviation. Presumably we should look for a form of the verb *χρεωστέω*, most probably *χρεωστούμένων*, agreeing with *έορτικών*.

3ff. As all the entries are abbreviated (cf. note to 6ff.), there is no way of being sure of the case intended, and the nominative has been supplied for convenience (this is of course the correct case if we read *χρεωστούει(ν)* in line 2).

3 There is a check-mark to the left of this entry but none for any of the other entries. A *νοσίνη έκκλησία* is mentioned as early as 295 in I 43 verso III 19 = W. Chr. 474; it also occurs in 1357 37 (see Antonini 178) and 4619 4. The order of words here might suggest that we have a reference to an *έκκλησία Νοσίνου*, attested in XIX 2243A 76 (Timm 289 confuses the two). If, however, the churches in 4617 are in the city of Oxyrhynchus, this church cannot be meant, as *Νότιων* was a *χωρίον* in the Oxyrhynchite nome (see Pruneti, *I centri abitati* 124); cf. also 4619 4.

The sigla for myriads of denarii are ligatured together. The one for denarii lacks the middle stroke (as often) and by line 6 has degenerated into a V-shape, with the symbol for myriads no more than a slight hook. On this symbol see W. M. Brashear, *ΖΡΕ* 60 (1985) 239–42.

4 1357 5 has an entry *είς τήν μαρτυρ( )*. Grenfell and Hunt considered expanding *Μαρτυρ(ίου)* but opted instead for *μαρτύρ(ων)*, and in this they are followed by Papaconstantinou (the reference in Antonini 173 and Timm 288 to *τὸ βορρηνὸν Μαρτύριον* in 1357 is confused: line 50 there reads ]τοβ[ only, and Papaconstantinou rightly rejects the restoration *τὸ β[ορρηνὸν μαρτύριον* as purely speculative). The present text and 4618 11 prove that the correct expansion is *Μαρτυρ(ίου)*. The church is also attested in P. Lond. V 1762.16, *τῆς ἀγίας έκκλη(σίας) Μαρτυρ(ίου)*, a papyrus which is now known to be from the Oxyrhynchite nome: see L 3600 recto 13 n. As the name is not accompanied by *άγιος*, Martyrius is more likely to have been the founder or owner rather than a saint; cf. 1357 introd., pp. 24–5, Antonini 131 f.

5 For this church see 4618 12 and note there.

6ff. It was a common practice to leave out *έκκλησία* and give just the name in the genitive when referring to churches named after a saint.

6 A church of St Stephen has not previously been attested at Oxyrhynchus. Isaac the Presbyter reports a bishop Stephanus in Oxyrhynchus in his Coptic *Life of Samuel of Kalamun* (ed. A. Alcock, Warminster 1983, sect. 38, p. 32), but as he lived probably in the early seventh century (cf. Timm, 292; A. Papaconstantinou, *ΖΡΕ* 111 (1996) 172–3), the church in 4617 cannot have been named after him. The church could of course have been named after the first martyr (there was a church of St Stephen at Arsinoe—see Antonini 170—and at Apollonopolis, P. Apoll. 99.3), but note also the Stephanus who suffered martyrdom in Antinoopolis together with Justus, the son of the emperor Numerian (cf. De Lacy O’Leary, *The Saints of Egypt*, New York 1937, 175). Is it significant that St Justus occurs in the next line in 4617? Cf. also the martyr Stephanos, priest of the Antinoopolite village of Lenaïos, whose martyrdom survives in P. Duk. inv. 438, ed. P. van Minnen, *AB* 113 (1995) 13–34.

7 See Antonini 176, Timm 288f. (where correct P. Oxy. 141 to 941); add 4620 12, 4618 24 and P. Stras. V 395.1. However, some of these references may be to a monastery; cf. P. Barison, *Aegyptus* 18 (1938) 77–8.

8 *Βαπτ(ιστοῦ)*: the apparatus perhaps indicates no more than the writer’s intention. Damage makes πττ difficult, π especially so; thereafter, the double curve cannot adequately represent the complexity of the abbreviation stroke.

The church is also attested in 4618 14, and 1357 47 has an entry *είς τὸν Βα]πτιστ[ήν* which must refer to this church. See further 4618 8 n.

9 See Antonini 177, Timm 288; cf. LVI 3862 27.

10 The line is blank after the name of the church with no indication of any payment due. For the church see Antonini 179, Timm 289. On St Thecla see now S. J. Davis in D. Frankfurter (ed.), *Pilgrimage and Holy Space in Late Antique Egypt* (1998) 303–39.

11 See Antonini 174–5, Timm 287; cf. **3862** 26. Also in PSI VIII 953.30–1 and Stud. Pal. X 35.6, both from the Oxyrhynchite; for the latter see **1357** introd., pp. 23–4.

12 The church is also attested in **4618** 2; on it see XVI **1898** 20 with note ad loc.

13 According to Timm 284, a martyr Victor at Oxyrhynchus is mentioned in the Coptic Pierpont Morgan Codex tom. 50 fol. 60b–61a. For the church see Antonini 179, Timm 289; add **4618** 1 and 17.

14 The monastery is attested in PSI 791.11; cf. also the τόπος Ἰαπα Λαμάκων in XVI **2025** 9. Λαμάκων is a characteristically Oxyrhynchite name.

15 In Antonini's list the only female name beginning with *M* is Μαρία. For a church of St Mary at Oxyrhynchus see Antonini 177, Timm 288; cf. P. Wash. Univ. I 6.5.

16 The restoration is inevitable, as ΓΑ is clear and no other name for a church beginning with these letters is attested. For a church of St Gabriel at Oxyrhynchus see Antonini 175, Timm 288; add **4618** 9 and 13.

18 See Antonini 175, Timm 287; add PSI 791.5, Stud. Pal. X 35.11, and **4620** 8. All the references are to a church of St Philoxenus except XVI **1950**, where ἄγιος is not used; there is a μοναστήριον Φιλοξένου in PSI 791.12; cf. P. Lond. IV 1762.17.

19 For St Julianus cf. **3862** 25–8 n. The church is probably attested in **1357** 48, where only ]Ἰουλ[ survives.

G. SCHMELZ

### 4618. LIST OF CHURCHES

22 3B.16/F(1)

16.6 × 29.5 cm

Sixth century  
Plate XII

The original document was cut down and turned at right angles to take a private letter on the back along the fibres, which was probably addressed to an ecclesiastic (ἡ ἐνλάβειά σου, 1); the letter, which is complete but in parts has suffered considerably from abrasion, is reserved for publication later.

The layout of **4618** suggests an original large format. I have assumed that line 1 was the first of the column, although only a few mm of the putative upper margin are extant. It is unclear whether the surviving column was preceded by others; if so, the ample right-hand margin indicates that this was the last. The script is a careful large upright cursive, mostly unligatured. I would assign it to the sixth century, earlier rather than later. There is a kollesis close to the left-hand edge. The hand responsible for the letter on the back suggests that that should date towards the end of the century.

The papyrus contains a list of churches. All line-beginnings are lost, and its exact purport is not clear. Nothing has been written after the church-names, so it seems unlikely that this was a financial document, recording expenses or income, as **4617**. But there is one particular feature which may offer a clue. Some of the churches are mentioned more than once: the churches of Phoebammon and Poemenike are referred to four times, while those of St Colluthus, St Gabriel, St Phoebammon, and St Victor receive two entries each. This is also the case with several of the churches which figure in XI **1357**, a calendar of church services of 535–36 (see A. Papaconstantinou, *REByz* 54 (1996) 135 ff., esp. 155–9); remarkably, the most prominent among them appears to be the church of Phoebammon (see further 7 n.). We may therefore envisage this list as part of a document of a liturgical nature. If this is correct, each entry would have been preceded by an indication of a festival, as

in **1357**. But the wording is different here, and recalls that of **4617**: nominatives (or genitives?), as opposed to constructions with *εἰς*.

Of the fifteen churches mentioned only one, the *ἐκκλησία Ποιμενικῆς*, has not been recorded previously. It is very probable that they were all located in the city of Oxyrhynchus; this is suggested by the overlaps with **1357**, which must have exclusively concerned city churches, as well as by the name of the church of Poimenike (see 4 n.). Three of the churches are known to have had their own *οἰκονόμοι*: St Colluthus (XVI **1934**), St Gabriel (VI **993**) and St Justus (VI **941**). This is easier to imagine in the context of the city than the country. The presence of *οἰκονόμοι* is also indicative of wealth, cf. E. Wipszycka, *Les ressources et les activités économiques des églises en Égypte du IV<sup>e</sup> au VIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (1972) 137. We may consider whether this is valid for the other churches too, that is, whether this is a group of religious establishments of considerable means.

- τοῦ] ἁγίου Βίκτορος  
 τοῦ] ἁγίου Νείλου  
 το]ῦ Ἐὐαγγελιστοῦ  
 ἐ]κκλ(ησία) Ποιμενικῆς  
 5 το]ῦ ἁγίου Ζαχαρίου  
 ἐ]κκλ(ησία) Ποιμενικῆς  
 ἐ]κκλ(ησία) Φοιβάμμωνος  
 το]ῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου  
 τ]οῦ ἁγίου Γαβριήλ  
 10 το]ῦ ἁγίου Κολλούθου  
 ἐ]κκλ(η)ς(ία) Μαρτυρίου  
 ἐ]κκλ(η)ς(ία) Παρὰ Ποταμ(όν)  
 το]ῦ ἁγίου Γαβριήλ  
 το]ῦ ἁγί(ου) Ἰωάννου Βαπτ(ιστοῦ)  
 15 το]ῦ ἁγίου Θεοδώρου  
 τ]οῦ ἁγίου Κολλούθου  
 το]ῦ ἁγίου Βίκτορος  
 το]ῦ ἁγίου Φοιβάμμωνος  
 ἐκ]κλ(ησία) Ποιμενικῆς  
 20 ἐκ]κλ(ησία) Φοιβάμμωνος  
 ἐκ]κλ(ησία) Φο[ι]βάμμωνος  
 ἐκ]κλ(ησία) Φοιβάμμωνος  
 ἐκκ]λ(ησία) Ποιμενικ(ῆς)

	τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰούστου				
25	τοῦ ἁγίου Φοιβάμμωνος				
	2 ἱ. Νίλου	3 εὐαγ'γελιστοῦ	4, 6, 7, 19-23 ἐκκλῆ	8 Ἰωαννου	11, 12 ἐκκλησί
12	ποταμῶ	14 αγ'τ βαπτῶ	23 ποιμενικῶ	24 Ἰουστου	25 ἱ. Φοιβάμμωνος

- 'Of St Victor.  
 'Of St Nilus.  
 'Of the Evangelist.  
 'Church of Poimenike.  
 5 'Of St Zacharias.  
 'Church of Poimenike.  
 'Church of Phoebammon.  
 'Of St John.  
 'Of St Gabriel.  
 10 'Of St Colluthus.  
 'Church of Martyrius.  
 'Church by the River.  
 'Of St Gabriel.  
 'Of St John the Baptist.  
 15 'Of St Theodorus.  
 'Of St Colluthus.  
 'Of St Victor.  
 'Of St Phoebammon.  
 'Church of Poimenike.  
 20 'Church of Phoebammon.  
 'Church of Phoebammon.  
 'Church of Phoebammon.  
 'Church of Poimenike.  
 'Of St Justus.  
 25 'Of St Phoebammon.'

1 τοῦ] ἁγίου Βίκτορος. Cf. 17. See **4617** 13 n.

2 τοῦ] ἁγίου Νείλου. See **4617** 12 n.

3 τοῦ] Ἐὐαγγελιστοῦ. The church is supposedly named after St John the Evangelist; see XI **1357** introd. (pp. 25-6), L. Antonini, *Aegyptus* 20 (1940) 175 f. (no. 13), S. Timm, *Das christlich-koptische Ägypten in arabischer Zeit* i. 287, Papaconstantinou, loc. cit. 144. To judge from his mention in the amulet VIII **1151** 43-6, the saint must have had a certain popularity at Oxyrhynchus.

4 ἐ]κκλ(ησία) Ποιμενικῆς. Cf. 6, 19, 23. This church appears to be new. It presumably derives its name from the well-known ἀμφοδον Ποιμενικῆς, last attested in XLVII **3355** 3 (535). For churches named after localities and not saints see Antonini, loc. cit. 133; there are of course several churches of villages and epoikia.

5 τοῦ] ἁγίου Ζαχαρίου. The church also in **1357** 52.

7 ἐ]κκλ(ησία) Φοιβάμμωνος. Cf. 20, 21, 22. This must have been an important church; it figures prominently

in **1357**, where it appears to have been visited on the occasion of eight *εὐνάξειε*, more than any other church (in the part that survives); see Papaconstantinou, loc. cit. 155. It is just possible that it had an important patron: as the name is not accompanied by *ἄγιος*, Phoebammon is likely to have been the founder or owner (Antonini, loc. cit. 178). We know of an Oxyrhynchite notable named Phoebammon who flourished shortly before the date of **1357** (535–6): Flavius Phoebammon, a *comes*, attested between 488 and 524; see *PLRE* ii 883 (Phoebammon 3). It might be worth considering whether the church was named after him. But there are other possibilities too: cf. the *comes* Fl. Phoebammon alias Lamason (cf. BL VIII 371) in P. Wash. Univ. I 25 (530)—unless he is the same person as the other Phoebammon.

8 το]ῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου. A church of St John also occurs in I **141** 3–4 (503): *θυρουρ(ῶ) τοῦ ἁγίου | Ἰωάννου*; cf. **4619** and **4622**, recording a *μαρτύριον τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου*. Who is this St John? At first sight, neither the Baptist, cf. 14, nor the Evangelist, cf. 3; the qualifying epithet is absent. We may also note that explicit references to the church of the Evangelist do not usually mention the name John (an exception is PSI VIII 953.82). But the scribe may have simply omitted the epithet, and this is the church of the Baptist (or the Evangelist). A St John without an epithet—a saint, not a church—also occurs in the letter LVI **3862** 26 (IV/V). We also know of a church of St John at Hermopolis; see J. Gascou, *Un codex fiscal hermopolite* (P. Sorb. II) p. 74. There is of course the possibility that he was a local saint; in that case the candidates would be numerous: cf. De Lacy O’Leary, *The Saints of Egypt in the Coptic Calendar* (1937) 164–73. The fragmentary Coptic church calendar, presumably from Oxyrhynchus, published by W. E. Crum, *ZNTW* 37 (1938–39) 23–32, records a day of veneration of [ΑΠΑΙΩΣ]ΑΝΝΗΣ ΜΠΑΚΕ ‘Apa John of Pake’ (A 22); in theory there could have been a church dedicated to him. Another entry concerns an ΑΠΑΙΩΣΑΝΝΗΣ without further qualification (B 41). St John Chrysostom (see *Coptic Encyclopedia* s.v.) might also be considered. All in all, I am inclined to believe that this is the church of a major saint, and the absence of an epithet was not a problem for the Oxyrhynchites.

9 το]ῦ ἁγίου Γαβριήλ. Cf. 13. See **4617** 16 n.

10 το]ῦ ἁγίου Κολλούθου. Cf. 16. For this church see Antonini, loc. cit. 174 (no. 4). For St Colluthus see W. E. Crum, *BZ* 30 (1929/30) 323–27; G. D. Gordini, *Bibliotheca Sanctorum* iv (1964) col. 89; and, for his hagiological dossier, U. Zanetti, *AB* 114 (1996) 10–24.

11 ἐ]κκλησ(ία) Μαρτυρίου. See **4617** 4 n.

12 ἐ]κκλησ(ία) Παρὰ Ποταμόν. Also attested in P. Lond. V 1762.19, where expand *Παρὰ Ποταμόν* instead of *παρὰ ποταμοῦ*, and **4617** 5. There are examples of *μηχαναί* called *Παρὰ Ποταμόν*; see LV **3804** 221 n.

The church was obviously situated on the bank of the Bahr Yussuf, as was the church which in Coptic and Islamic sources was the principal church of Oxyrhynchus; it may be parts of this church that remain incorporated into the first mosque in Bahnasa (Oxyrhynchus), that of Hassan ibn Salih, built at the end of the ninth century or early in the tenth century. See G. Fehérvári in *Oxyrhynchus: A City and its Texts* (forthcoming). However, we are not in a position to identify that church with the *ἐκκλησία Παρὰ Ποταμόν* here; there may well have been more than one church so located along the town’s long river frontage.

There is a remote possibility that this establishment, or another dependent on this one, is to be recognized in P. Amst. I 81 (V) *μ(αρτύ)ρ(ιον) Παρὰ Ποταμόν* (ed. pr. has *μ(οναστή)ρ(ιον)*), but cf. P. van Minnen, *AB* 113 (1995) 19). The same text refers to a *μ(αρτύ)ρ(ιον) τοῦ ἁγίου Στεφάνου* (l. 9); we may recall that in **4617** the entry on the church of St Stephen follows immediately after the entry on the church ‘By the River’ (ll. 5–6). This could just possibly suggest that the Amsterdam papyrus refers to Oxyrhynchite shrines.

14 το]ῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου Βαπτ(ιστοῦ). See **4617** 8 n.

15 το]ῦ ἁγίου Θεοδώρου. See LVIII **3958** 12 n. This St Theodore may well be the one known as *ὁ στρατηλάτης*, for whom see Th. Baumeister, *Martyr Invictus* (1972) 135–7.

18 το]ῦ ἁγίου Φοιβάμμωνος. Cf. 25. The church also occurs in SPP X 35.5; see **1357** introd. pp. 24–5.

24 το]ῦ ἁγίου Ἰούστου. See **4617** 7 n.

## 4619. LIST OF CHURCHES AND CHAPELS

50 4B.30/B(6-7)e

11 × 7 cm

Early sixth century

This fragment, seemingly from the foot of a column, attests a number of religious establishments of which at least one has not been recorded previously. Only one is called a ‘church’, ἐκκλη(ησία) νοτίνης in 4. The genitive here (see 4 n.), unless we are to assume the genitive throughout, might possibly indicate a topographical sub-heading, that is to say that the two premises following (5–6) were part of the south church or its complex or were in its parish. (SB I 5129 has a similar case mix, but cannot easily be explained in this way.) Two are εὐκτηρία, the first attestations of the term in an Oxyrhynchus papyrus, while the others are styled μαρτύρια. They were probably all situated in the city of Oxyrhynchus.

The nature of the text is not clear. It could have been a financial document, as e.g. **4617**; it could have served as a checklist to a prospective donor; or perhaps its purpose was liturgical, cf. **4618**.

Another list of μαρτύρια has been identified in MPER XVII 78 (VII/VIII), see A. Papaconstantinou, *ZPE* 130 (2000) 193–6; comparison with **4619** leaves little doubt that the Vienna text records shrines dedicated to martyrs, not books on martyrdoms. Cf. also P. Amst. I 81 (V), listing two μαρτύρια and one church, and clerics attached to them (on this text see further **4618** 12 n. para. 3).

The writing is along the fibres. The back is blank.

·	·	·	·	·	·
	[	εὐκ]	τηρ(ι-	) τοῦ	ἀγί(ου) [
	μαρτυρ(ι-	) τοῦ	ἀγί(ου)	Cερήνου	[
	εὐκτηρ(ι-	) τοῦ	ἀγί(ου)	ἄββᾶ Ἄνουπ	[
	ἐκκλη(ησία)	νοτίνης			[
5	μαρτυρ(ι-	) τοῦ	ἀγί(ου)	Μηνᾶ	[
	μαρτυρ(ι-	) τοῦ	ἀγί(ου)	Ἰωάννου	[
1	]τηρ	1, 2, 3, 5, 6	αγε	2, 5, 6	μαρτυρ
	3	ευκτηρ	4	εκκλ	χ

‘Chapel of St . . .

‘Martyrium of St Serenus . . .

‘Chapel of St Anup, abbot . . .

‘(Of the?) southern church . . .

‘Martyrium of St Menas . . .

‘Martyrium of St John . . .’

1 Cf. 3 n. Comparing line 3, there does not seem to be space for the initial supplement unless the line began in ecthesis, which would be odd and unexplained; yet the reading seems inevitable.

2 *μαρτυρ(ι-)*. The *μαρτύρια* were chapels dedicated to Christian martyrs. They usually preserved relics, and were often built on the actual spot of the martyrdom. See H. Eideneier, *ZPE* 6 (1970) 189 with n. 6 for references. The earliest instance of a *μαρτύριον* in a papyrus is P. Haun. III 67.2 (Oxy.; 398).

*μαρτυρ(ι-)* τοῦ ἀγί(ου) Σερήνου. This martyrion also occurs in XVI 1911 92 = LV 3804 164. Three other passages (XI 1357 4, 28–29, 53; PSI VII 791.7, VIII 953.10) attest an establishment called τοῦ ἀγί(ου) Σερήνου. All these texts date to the sixth century, and have been assumed to refer to the same religious institution; see S. Timm, *Das christlich-koptische Ägypten* (1984) i 289, A. Papaconstantinou, *REByz* 54 (1996) 143. A further reference now is 4620 10 (fifth/sixth century). There is of course a clear distinction between ἐκκλησία and μαρτύρια in LVIII 3960 20–1 (621) εἰς τὰς ἀγί(ας) ἐκκλησί(ας) καὶ ξενοδοχ(εῖα) καὶ μαρτύρ(ια) τῆς πόλεως καὶ ἐν ἀγροῖς, which probably reflects the distinction between καθολικαὶ ἐκκλησίαι and εὐκτήρια in canonical sources: cf. J. Gascou, *Un codex fiscal Hermopolite* = P. Sorb. II, pp. 71–2; and 1357 suggests that St Serenus' was a church of some importance. But in Oxyrhynchus the two terms ἐκκλησία and μαρτύριον 'are sometimes treated as synonymous at this period' (1357 introd. p. 23). 4619 and 4622 may add further support to this remark, with τοῦ ἀγίου Ἰωάννου, a church to judge from 4618, styled μαρτύριον; the term μαρτύριον could have been used for churches, as well as smaller chapels, named after martyrs. (This St Serenus was probably a martyr; see 1357 4 n., and H. Delehay, 'Les martyrs d'Égypte', *AB* 40 (1922) 8–9, 51.) On the other hand, the very fact that 4619 uses the different terms for the buildings may be an argument against their identity, supported by the passage just cited from 3960. That a 'martyrium' could be of considerable size, so that it would have an *oikonomos*, like wealthy churches, emerges from XVI 2019 65 (VI) διακόνου καὶ οἰκονόμου μαρτυρίου . . . . [For a similar problem in Hermopolis, with some churches also styled as εὐκτήρια, see P. Sorb. II pp. 71–2.

St Serenus' mention in the amulet VIII 1151 47 further attests the popularity of the saint in Oxyrhynchus.

3 *εὐκτηρ(ι-)* τοῦ ἀγί(ου) ἀββά Ἀνουῦπ. This and the less complete line 1 are the first occurrences of *εὐκτήρια* in Oxyrhynchus. For the term see P. Sorb. II pp. 71–2.

An Oxyrhynchite religious establishment dedicated to a St Anup is also new. The reference may be to an Anup who was martyred under Diocletian: see *Coptic Encyclopedia* i. 152 (I. Orlandi); also O'Leary, *The Saints of Egypt* 107–8, 208–9 for other possibilities. Other Christian institutions named after an Anup include a church in Lycopolis (P. Cair. Masp. III 67289.16 Ἄπα Ἀ[ν]ουφίου), and possibly a monastery in Aphrodito (P. Cair. Masp. III 67342 πρᾶγμα τοῦ ἀββά Ἀνουῦπ, with Timm, *Das christlich-koptische Ägypten* (1985) iii 1451).

4 ἐκκλη(ησίας) νοτίνης, apparently, cf. I 43 verso iii 19 τῆ νοτίνῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ, rather than ἐκκλη(ησία) νοτίνης, see introd. On this church see further 4617 3 n.

5 *μαρτυρ(ι-)* τοῦ ἀγί(ου) Μηνᾶ. This establishment is new, unless it is to be identified with the church of St Menas (cf. above 2 n.), for which see 4617 9 n.

6 *μαρτυρ(ι-)* τοῦ ἀγί(ου) Ἰωάννου. Possibly the same institution as the church τοῦ ἀγί(ου) Ἰωάννου. See 4618 8 n., 4622 2, 5; cf. above 2 n.

N. GONIS

#### 4620. OFFERINGS TO RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS

A22/5

5.5 × 30.5 cm

Fifth/sixth century

A long, narrow strip of papyrus, which is complete. The hand is not unlike that of 4617 and of the texts referred to in the introduction there, but may be a little later. It is probably to be assigned to the first half of the sixth century, although the later fifth century cannot be ruled out. The back is blank.

The content is a memorandum of payments in grain made or due for the ninth indiction, mostly to churches. For the relevant bibliography see 4617, introd. As several of these churches are attested in other documents from the Apion archive, it is probable that 4620



too belongs to papyri relating to this estate. Although there would appear to be no exact parallel to **4620** among published papyri, there is a good deal of evidence for great estates making contributions to churches and monasteries, see Hardy, 139–45, and Wipszycka, *Les ressources* 78–85; on pp. 109–20 she discusses charitable institutions dependent on churches.

† ἐπὶ τῆς θ ἰνδικ(τίωνος)  
 εἰς τὴν ἀγί(αυ) προσφορ(ὰν)  
 τῆς μάρμης  
 (ἀρτάβαι) υἱς  
 5 εἰς τροφ(ήν) τῶν χηρ(ῶν)  
 τῆς ἐκκλ(ησίας) Φοιβάμμ(ωνος)  
 (ἀρτ.) ς / (ἀρτ.) ρπβ ς /  
 εἰς τὸν ἄγι(ον) Φιλόξενον  
 (ἀρτ.) ρ  
 10 εἰς τὸν ἄγι(ον) Σερήνον  
 (ἀρτ.) ρ  
 εἰς τὸν ἄγι(ον) Ἰούστον  
 (ἀρτ.) κε  
 εἰς τὸ ξεν(ο)δοχ(εῖον) αὐτοῦ  
 (ἀρτ.) κε  
 15 εἰς τὸ Ἄνω Καισάριον  
 (ἀρτ.) λ  
 εἰς τὸ Μέγα Ὄρος  
 (ἀρτ.) λ  
 20 εἰς τὸ μοναστήρ(ιον) Λευκαδίου  
 (ἀρτ.) κ  
 εἰς τὰ Ἄπα Ἱερακίωνος  
 (ἀρτ.) ρ  
 εἰς τὸ μοναστήρ(ιον)  
 25 Ἄμα Ἰουλιανῆς  
 (ἀρτ.) ν  
 εἰς τὸ μοναστήρ(ιον)  
 Ἄμα Μαρίας  
 (ἀρτ.) ς  
 30 (γίνονται) (ἀρτ.) Απδ

1 ἰνδικ

2 ἀγεπροσφορ

4 et passim, see note

dot above *v* of υἱς

5 τροφ χηρρ

6 εκκλησίουβαμμυ 8, 10, 12 αγε 12 ἰουστον 14 ξειδοχς 16 I. Καϊσάρειον 20 μοναστηρ,  
so 24, 27 22 ἱερακιονος, κ corrected? 25 ἰουλιανης 30 /

‘In the 9th indiction.

‘For the holy mass(?) for our(?) grandmother 416 artabas.

‘For the maintenance of the widows of the church of Phoebammon <sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> artaba [per diem, making] 182 <sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> artabas [per annum].

‘For St Philoxenus 100 artabas.

‘For St Serenus 100 artabas.

‘For St Justus 25 artabas.

‘For its guest-house 25 artabas.

‘For the Upper Caesareum 30 artabas.

‘For the Great Desert 30 artabas.

‘For the monastery of Leucadius 20 artabas.

‘For the house of (?) Apa Hieracio 100 artabas.

‘For the monastery of Ama Juliana 50 artabas.

‘For the monastery of Ama Maria 6 artabas.

‘Total: 1084 artabas.’

2–3 On the various meanings of *προσφορά* in this connection see XVI **1898** 23 n., Hardy 143, and Wipszycka 65, 69–70. The reading *μάμμης* in line 3 is very probable, even though the second *μ* is rather broad (*Μαριάμης* cannot be read). Is this a reference to a donation or bequest, or does it rather refer to a funeral mass for a deceased lady of the Apion house? *προσφορά* can refer to any sort of pious donation, but is sometimes used specifically of donations for funeral masses and in consequence for the mass itself. Hardy, loc. cit., made the suggestion that some payments by large estates might be for requiems for deceased members of the family and that *προσφορά* might be a technical term for this. In some wills the testator makes provision for *τὰς ἀγίας μου προσφοράς*: see XVI **1901** 49–50, with references to further examples, in particular to P. Münch. I 8 (where see the note to line 5); cf. also P. Wash. Univ. I 56.16–18, κ]αὶ εἰς τὴν προσφορὰν τῆς νύμφης Ἡραΐδος (I. Ἡραΐδος) καθ’ ἐβδομάδαν ὁμοίως χαράγματα δέκα, and P. Cair. Masp. III 673.12.76, ὑπὲρ ἀγίας προσφοράς τῆς αὐτῆς μακαρ[ίας] μου γυναικός.

4 The symbol for artabas is like a cursive *θ* with extended cross-bar, but is probably intended to be a cursive *λ* merged into the horizontal stroke only of the more usual symbol *ϑ*. For illustrations see LI **3628** (Plate VII) and P. Laur. IV 173 (Plate CXIV).

5 On churches providing charitable aid for widows see R. Rémondon, *Chr. d’Ég.* 47 (1972) 265–6, Wipszycka 114–15, G. Tibiletti, *Atti XVII Congresso* iii. 989, P. Pruneti, *Paideia cristiana: studi in onore di Mario Naldini* (1994), 199–205 (a re-edition of XVI **1954–6**), and **4621**. Payments of wine recorded in SB XII 10926 include (l. 17) payment *ταῖς πρὸς χήραις*; cf. also **4622** and LVIII **3960** 23.

6 For this church see **4618** 7 n.

8 See **4617** 18 n.

10 See Antonini 178 and Timm 289; cf. LV **3804** 164 and Papaconstantinou’s note to **1357** 4 (*REB*)z 54, 154–5).

12 See **4617** 7 n.

14 For references in papyri to a *ξενοδοχεῖον*, especially one attached to a religious establishment, see G. Husson, *Akten XIII Kongresses*, 175–6, Wipszycka 115–19; add L **3600** 13 and P. Haun. III 64. See also LVIII **3960** 20 n., and P. van Minnen, in Ph. J. van der Eijk et al. (eds.), *Ancient Medicine in its Socio-Cultural Context* i (1995) 155–64, who gives further bibliography in n. 25 on p. 161.

16 P. Mert. I 41.12 records payment to a presbyter *τῆς ἀγίας ἐκκλησίας τοῦ Καϊσαρ(εῖου)* at Oxyrhynchus,

and PSI VII 791.10 records a monastery *Καϊσαρίου* there. See E. Wipszycka in G. Cavallo et al. (eds.), *Scrivere libri e documenti nel mondo antico* (Pap. Flor. XXX; 1998), 74–5. **4620** is the first text to refer to an ἄνω *Καϊσάρειον*.

18 In LV **3804** 284 payment is recorded to men who have gone *εἰς τὸ μέγα ὄρος*; the editor suggests that they may have gone to a monastery, a view which is strongly supported by the present text. For the use of ὄρος to mean ‘monastery’ see H. Cadell and R. Rémondon, *REG* 80 (1967) 346–9. A *χωρίον Μεγάλου Ὁρους* occurs in P. L. Bat. XXV 80.ii.7, and we should no doubt restore *ὑπὲρ τοῦ Μεγάλου Ὁρου* at PSI VIII 953.6; both texts are from the Oxyrhynchite nome.

20 *Λευκαδίου*: the stroke through the descender of ρ marking the abbreviation *μοναστήριον* also does duty as the first stroke of the λ. The reading is not in doubt although this monastery is not otherwise attested. A place known as *Νῆσος Λευκαδίου* is found several times in Oxyrhynchus texts: see Pruneti, *I centri abitati*, 120; for *Λευκαδίου* without *Νῆσος* she quotes only XLIII **3130** 3, which refers to a *μυλαῖον Λευκαδίου* (see her comments on p. 95). Cf. now also LXI **4131**, a receipt delivered to the Apion family by τὸ εὐαγές νοσοκομῖον τὸ καλούμενον *Λευκαδίου* for τὴν ἐξ ἔθους προσφοράν; see the note to lines 16–17.

22 Cf. perhaps P. Cair. Masp. III 67139 recto iii 25, where payments include *εἰς τὰ Ἄπα Ἰαγενίου* (similarly I 67002 iii 20, III 141 ii verso 20 and v recto 11). Some letters are addressed *εἰς τὰ* followed by a personal name, e.g. XLI **2980** (translated ‘to the house of’), and **4624** below. An anagnostes *τῆς ἀγίας ἐκκλησίας καλουμένης Ἄπα Ἰερακίωνος* at Oxyrhynchus occurs in P. Mert. III 124. A church of *ἀββᾶ Ἰερακίωνος* is attested in PSI VII 791.8 and 13, VII **1053** verso 23, XVIII **2206** 4 and PSI VIII 953.11; and a monastery of the same name in PSI 791.13; see Timm 290.

24–5 The monastery is also attested in XXIV **2419** 6.

27–8 A church of *Ἄμα Μαρία* at Oxyrhynchus is found in P. Wash. Univ. I 6.5 (and see **4617** 15 n.), but a monastery of this name has not hitherto been attested.

30 The total should be 1084½, but the symbol for ½ has not been written; nor has the stroke for thousands been added to the λ.

J. DAVID THOMAS

### 4621. ORDER TO SUPPLY WINE

3 1B.79/F(1–3)a

11.8 × 5.5 cm

Fifth/sixth century

An order to supply wine to widows of the same type and issued by the same man on the same day as XVI **1954–6**, re-edited by P. Pruneti in *Paideia cristiana: studi in onore di Mario Naldini* (1994) 199–205, esp. 201–2. **4621** is very probably by the same hand as the other three. Pruneti, 201, has argued for a date in the sixth century against the ‘late fifth century’ of the ed. pr.; a date not very far removed from the beginning of the sixth century seems likely: compare e.g. **4616** (525). Cf. **4622**.

The writing is across the fibres. The back is blank.

*Βίκτορι οἰνοπράτη.*

*δὸς ταῖς χήρ(αις) ἐκκλ(ησίας) Πτολεμίνου*

*οἴν(ου) δι(πλᾶ) ε μ(όνα). Μεσορῆ ις, ἰνδ(ικτίωνος) ε*

*ἀρχ(ῆ) ς.*

2 *χηρρ'εκκλ*

3 *οινϛΔ* (horizontal of δ cut by curve)

*μ*

*ινΔ*

4 *αρλ*

‘To Victor, wine-merchant. Give to the widows of the church of Ptoleminus 5 double jars of wine only. Mesore 16, indiction 5, beginning of the 6th.’

<sup>1</sup> *Βίκτορι*. He is presumably not the same person as the *οἰνοχειριστής* Victor of SB XVI 12608 (511) and **4622**.

<sup>2</sup> *χήρ(αις)*. Cf. **4620** 5. On widows in the Roman world one may consult J.-U. Krause, *Witwe und Waisen in römischen Reich* i–iii (1994–7).

*ἐκκλη(ησίας) Πτολεμίνου*. This church appears to be new. Its founder was evidently a certain Ptoleminus. The name is well attested in Oxyrhynchus; see **4597** introd.

<sup>3</sup> For the *διπλοῦν* see N. Kruit and K. A. Worp, *APF* 45 (1999) 117 n. 28. Mesore 16: possible dates include 9 August 497, 512, 527.

<sup>4</sup> *ἀρχ(ῆ) σ*. For the formula see R. S. Bagnall and K. A. Worp, *The Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt* 26–7, with LIX **3985** 1 n. para. 3.

N. GONIS

#### 4622. ORDER TO SUPPLY WINE

23 3B.13/M(2–4)a

8 × 6 cm

Fifth/sixth century

The order is of the same format, type, and date as XVI **1954–6** and **4621** (but the hands are different, **4622** omits *δός*, and it comes from an excavation season different from **4621**). Those four texts are addressed to an *οἰνοπράτης* named Victor; **4622** is also addressed to a Victor, but he is an *οἰνοχειριστής*; see further 1 n.

The text is written across the fibres. The docket on the back, close to the upper edge, runs along the fibres.

*Βίκτωρι οἰνοχειρ(ιστῆ).*  
*ταῖς χήρ(αις) τοῦ ἀγί(ου) Ἰωάννου*  
*οἴνου διπλοῦν ἔν, γί(νεται) δι(πλοῦν) α//.*  
*Ἄθῶρ κε//.*

Back:

<sup>5</sup> *μαρτύρ(ιον?) τοῦ ἀγί(ου) Ἰωάννου*

1 *οινοχειρ*      2 *χηρβ*      ἰωαννου      2,5 *αγι*⊃      3 *γεδ*      5 *μαρτυρ*

‘To Victor, wine-steward. For the widows of St. John one double jar of wine, total double jar 1. Hathyr 25.’

(Back) ‘Martyrium of St. John.’

<sup>1</sup> *Βίκτωρι οἰνοχειρ(ιστῆ)*. This person may be the same as the *οἰνοχειριστής* *Οὐίκτωρ* of SB XVI 12608, of 511 (it is doubtful that XIX **2243A** 37 (590), *κληρ(ονόμων) Βίκτορος ἀπὸ οἰνοχειρ[ιστ(ών)]* refers to the same man). There is of course a strong temptation to identify him with the *οἰνοπράτης* Victor (see introd.), but the terms *οἰνοχειριστής* and *οἰνοπράτης* are not equivalent: the former is the person responsible for the wine production of

(part of) an estate, see LVIII 3960 introd. para. 3, the latter a wine-seller. The distinction is clear in SB 12608 (with BL IX 287). In whose service Victor was, cannot be determined on present evidence. Other documents associating wine-stewards and churches include the roughly contemporary XVI 1951, an order issued by the 'holy church' to an *οἰνοχειριστής*, and BGU II 693 (= SPP VIII 1150).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. 4620 5 n.

τοῦ ἀγί(ου) Ἰωάννου: cf. 5. See 4618 8 n., 4619 6 n.

<sup>4</sup> Hathyr 25 = 21/22 November.

μαρτύρ(ιον?). The case is uncertain. For the term see 4619 2 n.

N. GONIS

### 4623. ORDER TO SUPPLY OLD AXLES TO A CHURCH

67 6B.11/H(1)

30 × 6.5 cm

Later sixth century

A eunuch is instructed to provide four old axles to a church situated in an *ἐποίκιον* known to belong to the household of the Apions. Donations to churches by the Apion family, especially to those they owned, are well attested, see E. Wipszycka, *Les ressources et les activités économiques des églises* 80–1, but the supply of old axles is a novelty. The axles, presumably no longer good as parts of irrigation machines, would be a source of wood, to be used according to the needs of the church.

A further point of interest is the occurrence of a eunuch, a welcome addition to the meagre evidence on eunuchs in Byzantine Egypt. This is also the first record of the employment of eunuchs by the Apion family.

The writing is across the fibres and the back is blank.

Ϡ Χρυσάνθω εὐνούχ(ω). (vac.) παράσχ(ου) εἰς χρείαν τῆς ἀγίας ἐκκλησίας  
ἐποικ(ίου) Εὐαγγελίου  
[[κ. . .]] παλαιὸν ἀξῶνα τέσσαρα, γίνονται [[κ. . .]] παλαι(οὶ) ἀξῶν(ε)ς  
δ μό(νοι). Χοιάκ 5'' ἰνδ(ικτίωνος) ιδ//.

<sup>1</sup> ευνουχῆ παρασχῆ εποικ' <sup>2</sup> l. ἄξων- γε παλαι αυξων' μο// (stroke from omicron crosses diagonals) ωλ

'To Chrysanthus, eunuch. Deliver for the use of the holy church of the epoikion Euangeliou four old axles, total old axles 4 only. Choiak 6, indiction 14.'

<sup>1</sup> Χρυσάνθω. O. Claud. I 153.1–2 (100–120) and II 350.1 (mid-II) are the only other published texts from Egypt recording this name, which, however, is not uncommon outside Egypt, see *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* II, IIIa.

εὐνούχ(ω). See LV 3820 15 n., CPR XIV 42.16 n. with references. The practice of employing eunuchs was much in vogue among the nobility of the Late Empire; the Apions were no exception. Another eunuch in the service of an Egyptian aristocrat, the *ἐνδοξότατος στρατηλάτης* Cyrillus, occurs in BGU III 725 (Ars.; 618).

'Castration was strictly prohibited within the bounds of the empire . . . in general eunuchs . . . were imported from abroad' (A. H. M. Jones, *Later Roman Empire* ii. 851); this might account for the name Chrysanthus. However, the name of the eunuch in BGU 725, ἄπα Ὀλ, may suggest an Egyptian origin (it is typical of the Fayum: see

T. Derda and E. Wipszycka, *JJP* 24 (1994) 52), which in turn would be an example of illegal castration, for which there is some evidence: see Jones, op. cit. 852. The name of the eunuch in P. Lond. IV 1447.171 (685–705), Γεώργιος, has likewise nothing exotic about it (CPR XIV 42.16 Παύλου ευνούχου is too uncertain to be useful). But, as usual, it would be hazardous to draw firm conclusions from onomastics: people away from their homeland do not always retain their original names—and this was certainly the case with slaves, cf. F. A. J. Hoogendijk, *APF* 42 (1996) 232 n. 1. 3.

ἐκκλησία ἐποικ(ίου) Ἐναγγελίου. This church also occurs in XVIII 2195 86 as the recipient of an amount of wheat and money issued by a *pronoetes*. For the epoikion, which formed part of the Apion estate, see P. Pruneti, *I centri abitati dell'Ossirinchi* (1981) 49–50. The church too would have been the property of the Apions; for such churches see Wipszycka, *Les ressources* 26–7.

<sup>2</sup> The significance of the original correction before παλαιός (and before παλαι(οί) later in the line) is not clear. Possibly κατ = και(νούς) was written, though this would leave an awkward gap before αἰξίωνας. It is also odd how the end of παλαιός overruns the following word. The underwriting below παλαι(οί) is more obscure, but ought to be parallel.

παλαιούς αἰξίωνας (l. ἄξιωνας). For the term and the spelling see LIX 4000 8 n. Old axles were surrendered to the estate authorities on receipt of new ones; cf. XXXVI 2779 21–22 (530) τοῦ δὲ παλαιοῦ ἄξιωνος [κ]ατενεχθέντος καὶ | δοθέντος εἰς τὴν μεγάλην γεουχικὴν οἰκίαν. We hear of deliveries of old axles in I 137 24 (584) and XVI 1988 30–1 (587) τὸν δὲ παλαιὸν δοθέντα τῷ θυρουρῷ. Old axles are also mentioned in XIX 2244 35. Axles were made of wood; the well-known scarcity of wood in Egypt ‘would have favoured the careful salvage of damaged devices for rebuilding or simply as fuel’ (J. P. Oleson, *Greek and Roman Mechanical Water-Lifting Devices* (1983) 340). I think it likely that in this case the church was to function as a repository of axles, which is attested elsewhere, see XIX 2244 1–2 n., 83, 85.

Choiak 6 = 2/3 December.

N. GONIS

## V. PRIVATE LETTERS

### 4624. DIUS TO SARAPION

34 4B.74/N(2-3)a

14.7 × 18.6 cm

First century  
Plate IX

A business letter in which the gymnasiarch Dius (see 22) instructs his agent Sarapion to do three kinds of tasks: one relating to the selling of grain and lentils, another concerning the collection of various sums of money, and the third regarding the woodwork of an ἐξέδρα.

A distinctive feature of the letter is that its different topics are separated by paragraphoi, sometimes in combination with short preceding lines or spaces or both, making clear its function as a memorandum. Spaces as punctuation are frequent (3, 7, 14, 17, 19) but the reasons for other spaces are less obvious (e.g. 4, 8, 10); the same applies to the paragraphus between 15 and 16. There are remains of a kollesis in the left margin.

On the back is an unusual address, arranging for delivery of the letter to the sender Dius' own home or country estate, for his agent Sarapion's attention there: see 22 n.

Δίος *Καραπίωνι τῶι φιλ(τάτω) χ(αίρειν)*.  
εἰ βραδέως ἀγοράζεται τὰ σιτάρια  
μὴ πώλει ἄρτι. τάχα γὰρ σὺν  
θεῶ ἀναβησόμεθα καὶ χρεία  
5 ἡμεῖν αὐτῶν ἔστι.  
καὶ τὸν φακὸν δὲ ἐλάσσονος (δραχμῶν) ἡ  
μὴ πώλει. Θεαγένην τὸ λοιπὸν  
τοῦ τόκου ἀπαίτησον,  
καὶ Ζώιλον τὸν ἀδελφόν μου  
10 καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους πάντας.  
καὶ τὰς συντάξεις μου ἀπαίτησον.  
τὰς δοκοὺς τῆς ἐξέδρας, εἰ μὲλλον  
τε δοκῶσαι, λίβα ἐπ' ἀπηλιώτην  
βάλετε. μὴ οὖν ἄλλως πώσης,  
15 μὴ ἵνα μοι ἐμπαίξῃς  
καὶ ἀναγκάσῃς ἐμὲ ἄνωθεν  
κατασπᾶν. ἔγραψα γὰρ σοι  
καὶ τὴν διαφορὰν δι' ἐτέρας  
ἐπιστολῆς. ἀσπάζου το[ῦ]ς σοὺς

20 [πάντας.] ἔρρωσο. μη(νός) Γερμανικῆ[ου]  
κη̄.

(Back)

εἰς τὰ Δείου γυμνασι (vac.) ἀρχ(ου) Σαραπίω(νι) φροντιστ(ῆ).

1 φιλ̄χ̄ς 5 1. ἡμῶν 6 ς 9 Ζωῖλον 14 1. ποιήσης 20 μ<sup>7</sup> 22 1. Δίου  
γυμνασι (space) ἀρχσαραπίωφροντιστ<sup>7</sup>

‘Dius to Sarapion his dearest colleague, greetings.

‘If wheat is being bought slowly, do not sell just now because soon we shall come up, god willing, and we have need of it.

‘Moreover, do not sell the lentils for less than 8 drachmas.

‘Demand the rest of the interest from Theagenes, and from Zoilus my brother and all the others.

‘And demand my allowances.

‘As for the beams of the outhouse, if you are about to put them in, lay them from west to east. So don’t do it any other way, lest you play a trick on me and force me to pull it down again. I explained the advantage to you in another letter. Greetings to all your family.

‘Farewell. The month Germaniceus, the 28th.’

(Back) ‘(Deliver) to the residence of Dius, gymnasiarch; for Sarapion, agent.’

1 Δῖος. Gymnasiarch, cf. the address on the back (22). Not in P. J. Sijpesteijn, *Nouvelle liste des gymnasiarques* (1986) and apparently unattested, given the first-century palaeographical date and that we may suppose him to be gymnasiarch of Oxyrhynchus or of Alexandria (see 4 n.) with estates in the Oxyrhynchite nome.

τῶι φιλ(τάτω). This term in the heading of a letter tends to denote a colleague rather than a friend. Sarapion was a φροντιστής, cf. 22; for the functions and social status of φροντισταί see D. Rathbone, *Economic Rationalism and Rural Society* 79–82.

2 For the neuter plural with singular verb cf. Mayer, *Grammatik* ii<sup>3</sup>. 28–9.

4 ἀναβηρόμεθα (for the mark before its first α see 10 n.) is more likely to imply travel from Alexandria to the Oxyrhynchite nome than from Oxyrhynchus itself out into the nome, given that 2 implies both market variations and the writer’s ignorance of the local situation.

6 For καὶ . . . δέ see Denniston, *Greek Particles* 199 ff.

Information on the price of lentils is limited; see XLVII 3345 46–7 n. If we may equate or nearly equate their price with that of wheat, 8 dr./art. is a figure widely attested in connection with the latter in the first and early second centuries. It is difficult to assess the 8 dr. figure as a market price because of the variations due to agricultural conditions and because much of the evidence relates to compulsory purchase. See XLI 2958 introd.

10 Mark like a check-mark before ἄλλου. There is another before ἀναβηρόμεθα in 4, which would be less clear were it not for this example in 10.

11 συντάξεις. Here this can hardly have its usual meaning of contributions for the maintenance of temple personnel, disbursed to them as wages or allowances, for which see e.g. J. D. Thomas in *Misc. Pap.* ii. (= *Pap. Flor.* XIX) 522–3. A closer parallel is XLII 3048 19, where the συντάξεις are estate payments, being monthly allowances for φροντισταί, γεωργοί and others. On that basis, Dius may have been seeking to extract from his associates their contributions to the estate running costs.



12 ἐξέδρα. See A. K. Orlandos and I. N. Travlos, *Λεξικὸν Ἀρχαίων Ἀρχιτεκτονικῶν Ὄρων* 103; LI **3644** 20 n., where the sense ‘barn’, ‘outhouse’ is suggested; G. Husson, *OIKIA* 73–7, concluding that the common features of these structures, whatever their purpose, were that they were at ground-level (although they could have an upper floor, pp. 76–7) and open on one side.

12–14 The significance of laying the beams west-to-east (instead presumably of north-to-south) remains unclear. To emphasize the importance of spanning a flat-roofed building parallel with its shorter dimension seems too simple, although see below. Possibly this building was a lean-to with a sloping roof, where it would be important for the load-bearing capacity of the beams that they should slope down from the roof line, not lie horizontally from gable to gable. Such a roof, presumably tiled, would be unexpected, however; this type of roof would rather be found in a major public building; cf. the baths in LXIV **4441** col. ix where this was taken to be the implication of *κεραμίδες δστράκινες* (l. *δστράκιναι*), 23.

Whether the building was flat-roofed or sloping, placing the beams in the structurally less sound direction would mean less work (because there would be fewer beams—though since they would be longer and therefore more expensive, it would probably not mean less cost), and it may be this that Dius was afraid Sarapion would do.

15 For *μη ἴνα* cf. A. Bülow-Jacobsen, *ZPE* 110 (1996) 125–6, with references. For *ἐμπαίξις* see *ibid.* 126.

20–1 The 28th of the month of Germaniceus (= Pachon) = May 23rd.

22 (Back) For the *εἰς τὰ* formula cf. XLI **2980** 14 (where the note refers to the present papyrus) and III **529** 18; LVIII **3952** 11 n.; S. Llewelyn, *ZPE* 101 (1994) 71–8 and *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity* 7 (1994), esp. 38ff.

Since Dius (see line 1) is sending the letter to his own address, he is either away from Oxyrhynchus (the solution perhaps favoured by the town site being the find spot of the papyrus) or possibly sending the letter from there to another property of his in the country, cf. 4 n.

A space has been left for the tie, bisecting *γυμνασι* | *ἀρχ(ου)*, but there is no trace of the usual associated ink-marks (see XLVIII **3396** 32 n.).

For *φροντισταί* cf. 1 n.

J.-L. CALVO MARTÍNEZ

#### 4625. MAXIMUS TO OFELLIUS

21 3B.29/C(1–2)a

14 × 10 cm

Third century?

Plate IV

This complete short business letter regarding the repayment of a debt is written in a striking large upright hand with few ligatures. It is probably the sender Maximus who has added the closing farewell in his own hand (perhaps showing Latin influence: note form of *χ*), tight under the preceding text at lower right. The writing is along the fibres.

Μάξιμος Ὀφελλίω τῶι  
 τειμωτάτῳ χαίρειν.  
 καλῶς ποιήσεις μεταβαλό-  
 μενος τὰς δύο μνᾶς Ἡρᾶ τῷ  
 5 ἀδελφῷ σου ἐπεὶ πάνυ ἐνο-  
 χλοῦμαι ὑπὸ τῶν πεπιστευ-

κότων. ἀλλ' ὄρα μὴ ἀμελ[λ]ήσης.  
 (m. 2) ἔρρωσθαί σε  
 εὖχομαι.

(Back, m. 1)

10 Ὀφελλίω \ / π(αρά) Μαξίμου.  
 / \

2 1. τιμωτάτω 5 ἐπεὶ corr. 10 π'

‘Maximus to the most honoured Ofellius, greetings.

‘Be so good as to pay over the two minas to your brother Heras, since I am much pressed by the creditors. See you do not neglect this.’

(2nd hand) ‘I pray for your health.’

(Back, 1st hand) ‘To Ofellius’ (*design*) ‘from Maximus.’

1 There may be no connection between either Maximus or Ofellius and the Ofellius Maximus who occurs in the undated but third-century XL 2920 5.

3–4 καλῶς ποιῆεις μεταβαλλόμενος. So LIX 3979 3.

10 In the address on the back, the cross marking where the seal had been has its centre missing, as usual. See 4624 22 n.

J.-L. CALVO MARTÍNEZ

#### 4626. NILUS TO THALIA

12 1B.142/E(a)

11.5 × 12.2 cm

After 259

A letter devoted to family matters, cryptic in part, written on the back of the lower right corner of a petition from Aurelius Dioscorus dated 259 (year 6 of Valerian, Gallienus, and Valerian Caesar), in a fluid cursive hand of the later third century.

The letter shows six clear vertical folds. On the front, a vertical strip 2–3 cm broad was washed to take the address, at 90° to the petition and beginning from its foot. The structure is not fully clear; there may be a manufacturer’s three-layer kollesis at the extreme right edge of the front.

→ Νεῖλος Θαλία χαίρειν.  
 ἐκομικάμην τὰ τυρία δι’ Ἀντωνίνου,  
 καὶ ἀγαγοῦσα τὴν ἐσφραγισμένην  
 ἐπιστολὴν γινώσκει ὡς ἐλπούμην.  
 5 ἡ[ὸν δ]έ, [γ]ράψας ὅ τι ἦν πρὸ μηνῶν δύο,

γράφεις, “ἐκομισάμην σου ἕτερα γράμματα  
 ὅπου [οὐδ]᾽ ἐν γράφεις.” ταῦτ’ οὖν παρώχεται.  
 ἐὰν γὰρ ἐ[ῦ]ρω τινὰ γνήσιον, πεμφθήσεται  
 σοι. πᾶν δὲ ποίησον πέμψαι μοι καὶ τὰς  
 10 ἐλαίας. [π]ε[ρ]ὶ ὧν χρήσεις γράφε μοι εἰδυία  
 [ὄ]τι οὐκ ἀμελῶ. τὸν καλὸν Ἀγαθόποδα ἀσπά-  
 ραι καὶ εἰ κ[αί(?)] αὐτὸς ἡμῖν οὐ γράφει.  
 [ἐ]ρρωσθαί σε εὔχομαι, κυρία μου  
 ἀδελφή.

(Down left margin)

15 τὸν καλὸν Ἀγαθὸν [Δ]αίμονα ἀσπάζου. μάθε τὴν  
 σπουδὴν ἣν πεποιή[ται] τῇ φί[λ]ῃ σου μηδὲν ἀναλωσάσει.

(Back, ↓)

Θαλία ≡ ≡ ≡  
 ≡ ≡ ≡ Νείλος  
 ≡ ≡ ≡

1, 17 l. Νείλος, Θαλία

‘Nilus to Thalia, greetings.

‘I received the small cheeses via Antoninus; when you read my sealed letter you will know how distressed I was. But now, although I wrote what the matter was two months ago, you write “I have received other letters from you in which you write nothing.” Well, this is all in the past. For if I find someone reliable, it will be sent to you. Do your best to send me the olives also. Regarding what you need, write to me, knowing that I am not neglectful. Greetings to the excellent Agathopous, even if he too(?) does not write to us. I pray for your health, my lady sister.’

(Margin) ‘Greetings to the excellent Agathus Daemon. Know the care which he has taken of your lady friend although she has spent nothing.’

(Address) ‘To Thalia’ (*ink marks*) ‘Nilus.’

1 The name Thalia has not occurred before in a documentary text in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*.

5ff. These lines are not certainly articulated and understood.

11 Agathopous is commonly a slave name; for Oxyrhynchus cf. XLIV 3197 15.

13 Unexplained unaligned traces before the beginning of this line.

16 For *σπουδὴν ποιέεσθαι* with the dative cf. the private letter O. Mich. 91 (there ἡμῶν).

17 On designs of this type associated with addresses see XLVIII 3396 32 n.



‘Pachon 20.’

(Back) ‘To my lord brother Hieracapollon’ (*ink marks*) ‘Sarammon.’

4-5 οὐκ εἰς ὀλίγην γάρ με ἀγωνίαν ἐνέβαλας (l. -εε): this seems to be an epistolary cliché, cf. ἐς τηλικαύτην σε ἀγωνίαν . . . ἐνέβαλον (VI 939 11–12) and λίαν εἰς λύπην με καὶ ἀγωνίαν φέρει (BGU III 884.5–6).

5 For the postponement of γάρ see Denniston, *Greek Particles* 95ff.; cf. E. W. Handley, *Dyskolos* p. 142 (66–8 n.).

For the form ἐνέβαλας see Gignac, *Grammar* ii. 335ff., esp. 342.

10 It is not impossible that ὕμων was also given a diaeresis over ω, but there are further marks over υ and over αc preceding, as well as more obviously extraneous ink interfering with the line above, and probably apart from ὕ- all these supralinear marks are offsets.

16 Pachon 20 = 15 May.

17 (Back) The name of the sender is given in the address on the back as Sarammon, not Serenus (2). Cf. LXV 4493, although there it seems clear that two persons are involved, which may not be the case here. Neither writer nor addressee has been identified in other Oxyrhynchus papyri.

For the coarse and messy ink-marks that interrupt the address, cf. 4626 17 n.

J.-L. CALVO MARTÍNEZ

#### 4628. GERONTIUS TO COLLUTHUS

44 5B.63/(48–49) a

10.8 × 29 cm

Fourth century  
Plate X

In this interesting though puzzling letter Gerontius writes to his ‘son’ Colluthus, a *domesticus* (32), concerning problems with the billeting of some soldiers. The *Μαῦροι*, soldiers of a unit well attested in several papyri, are mentioned in 9, see 9–10 n.; 4628 in conjunction with LX 4084 may now attest a short-lived station of the unit at Oxyrhynchus.

The word *μιτάτωρ* (= *μητάτωρ*) occurs in 10 and 24. It is the Greek transcription of the Latin word *metator*, indicating a military billeting officer. See further 10 n.

There is a kollesis close to the right edge. On the back there are possibly very faint traces of the address.

κυρίῳ μου νιῶ Κολλοῦθῳ  
 Γερόντιος χαίρειν.  
 οἶδεν ὁ θεός, οὐδέποτε  
 ἠνώχλησα πραιποσί-  
 5 τῳ διὰ ξενίας τῶν βο-  
 ηθῶν μου ἢ ναυτῶν  
 ἢ τροφίμων ἢ ἄλλου τι-  
 νὸς διαφέροντός μοι,  
 ἀλλὰ ἀφ’ οὗ οἱ Μαῦροι ἐνθά-  
 10 δε ἦσαν τοὺς μιτάτορας

τιμῶ καὶ ἀλύπους ποιῶ  
 καὶ οὐδέποτε ἀντιλέγου-  
 ςί μοι. οἱ νῦν κατασταθέν-  
 τες, ζητηθέντες ὑπ' ἑ-  
 15 μουῦ πολλάκις καὶ εὐρε-  
 θέντες, οὐ κατηξίωσαν  
 ἔλθειν πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀλλὰ  
 ἀπελθόντες εἰςβάλλου-  
 ςι στρατιώτας εἰς τὰς δια-  
 20 φερούσας ἡμῖν οἰκίας. οὐ  
 θέλω οὖν οὐδὲ νῦν ἐνο-  
 χλῆσαι τῷ κυρίῳ μου τῷ  
 πραιποσίτῳ ἀλλὰ τιμῆ-  
 ςαι τοὺς μιτάτορας καὶ τι-  
 25 μηθῆναι παρ' αὐτῶν.  
 παρακαλῶ οὖν, κύριε υἱέ,  
 συμβούλευσον αὐτοῖς ἔλ-  
 θεῖν πρὸς ἐμέ· ἄτοπον γάρ  
 ἔστιν ὑβρισθῆναι ἡμᾶς  
 30 οὐδέποτε ὑβρισθέντας ἐπὶ  
 τῶν ξένων, μάλιστα σοῦ τοῦ  
 υἱοῦ δομεστικοῦ ὄντος. οὐ θυ-  
 νηθεὶς δὲ ἔλθειν διὰ τὴν ἀνα-  
 χώρησιν γράφω. ἐρρώσθαί σε  
 35 εὐχομαι πολλοῖς χρό-  
 νοις, κύριε υἱέ.

10, 24 l. μιτάτορας

14 ὑπ

21 λ of θέλω corr.

29 ὑβρισθηναι

30 ὑβρισθεντας

‘To my lord son Colluthus, Gerontius, greeting.

‘God knows! I never bothered a *praepositus* about lodging for my assistants or boatmen or dependents or any other person belonging to me, but from the time the Moors were here I show respect to the billeting officers and keep them free of anxiety and they never contradict me. Those now appointed, although I have sought *them* out often and found them, have not condescended to come to us, but go off and thrust soldiers into the houses which belong to us. I do not want, then, even now to bother my lord the *praepositus*, but to show respect to the billeting officers and to be shown respect by them. Please, then, my lord

son, advise them to come to me, for it is absurd for us to be harassed when we have never been harassed over visiting troops (before), especially as you, my son, are a *domesticus*. I am writing since I am unable to come because of the subsidence of the flood (? or ‘the (= my?) departure?’). I pray for your health for many years, my lord son.’

3 οἶδεν ὁ θεός. See M. Naldini, *Il Cristianesimo in Egitto* 14.

4 ἡνώχλησα. For the double augment (usual in Attic) in the papyri, see F. Gignac, *Grammar* ii. 253.

4-5 *πραποσίτω* could mean the *praepositus pagi* or more probably a military *praepositus*. Gerontius could appeal to the *praepositus pagi* as the highest civil officer involved in the administration of the territory. In the Abinnaeus archive (cf. P. Sak. 46 = P. Thead. 22 and P. Sak. 47 = P. Thead. 23 = P. Abinn. 44) there are examples of people applying to the *praepositus pagi* and to military officers at the same time. Since Gerontius is writing to a *domesticus* (32), it seems likely that the *praepositus* mentioned in 4-5 and 23 is a military commander, and Gerontius is seeking help against the billeting officers through the commander’s adjutant.

5-6 τῶν βρηθῶν μου ἢ ναυτῶν. Who are these people, and what is Gerontius’ position when he refers to them as his own? It seems clear, first of all, that they are travelling persons who might be lodged in billets, except that Gerontius has never sought this privilege for them. The implication here might be that such people were not officially entitled to such lodgings, but that others in a similar position to Gerontius did use their influence to obtain billets for their subordinates unofficially. Gerontius was perhaps a municipal notable rather than a government official; he was obviously wealthy: note e.g. the plural τὰς διαφερούσας ἡμῖν οἰκίας, 19-20. If ναυτῶν means more than just the crew of his personal river transport, perhaps he operated a business based on commercial river traffic; if so, this might be the context for his inability to travel because of τὴν ἀναχώρησιν, 33-4 (cf. note ad loc.), although the connection remains obscure.

9-10 ἀφ’ οὗ οἱ Μαῦροι ἐνθάδε ἦσαν. A *cuneus* of Mauri formed a well-attested garrison troop at Hermopolis from 340 (BGU I 21) to the early sixth century. Another *cuneus* stationed at Lycopolis is attested by *Not. Dign. Or.* 31, 23, LXIII 4381 (375), and BGU XII 2137 (426). To the references given by F. Mitthof, *Proc. XX Congr. Pap.* 260-2 and n. 13, add O. Oasis p. 29 (text 11), SPP III 293 and VIII 999 (F. A. J. Hoogendijk, *Aeg.* 74 (1994) 25-31), SPP VIII 1050, LX 4084 (6.5.339) and Hoogendijk, *APF* 42 (1996) 225-34 with a good bibliography on p. 231. (We owe these references to Dr Bernhard Palme.)

The words appear to mean ‘since the Mauri were here’, implying that the letter was written from an area where the Mauri were no longer stationed, unless the Greek can be interpreted as ‘since the Mauri came here’, which is very doubtful. It would be tempting to believe that the letter was exchanged between men both living in the area of Oxyrhynchus and that this text gives the first indication that Mauri were there for a very short period in or before 339, before going on to Hermopolis and/or Lycopolis. However, the only item which might be brought forward as supporting evidence is LX 4084 (6 May 339), the head of a document in which the local *curator civitatis* was addressed by the wife of a soldier of the *numerus* of *equites Mauri scutarii comitatenses*; she was temporarily resident in Oxyrhynchus, he was ‘with the vexillation’ (μετὰ τῆς οὐξηξίλλατιωνος), although the following word, restored as [?ἐκδη]μορ[ῶ]ντος, is obviously very uncertain and cannot be taken to prove that he was absent from Oxyrhynchus.

ἐνθάδε, 9-10, might at first sight imply somewhere else than Oxyrhynchus since of course the letter was found there. The opposite is more likely to be true: Gerontius appeals to a *local* official to help with his problems, and is therefore himself in Oxyrhynchus or nearby. Note that he asks that the billeting officers should come to see him, ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ἐμέ, 27-8, so that he can hardly be very far away. The difficulty is τὴν ἀναχώρησιν, 33-4, but see the note ad loc. on the possible implications of this.

10 τὸν κατάτορα. *Metatores* were charged with requisitions for military quartering, see E. Fabricius, *PW* XV, 2 s.v.; R. Rémondon, *Rech. Pap.* 1 (1961) 61-5 (on SB VI 9613); SB I 2253 and V 8651. For the *metatum* or *hospitalitas* see B. Kramer, *ZPE* 77 (1989) 213; a further example is A. Bernard, *De Thèbes à Syène*, no. 196 (Byz.; with J. Gascoü, *Trav. et Mém.* 12 (1994) 323-42). See also C. Theod. VII 8; C. Just. XII, 40; A. H. M. Jones, *LRE* 249-53; W. Goffart, *Barbarians and Romans* (Princeton 1980) 40-55.

This might be the place to suggest that we ought to recognize the word \*σταβλομῆτων (first *o* corrected from *ω*, as several times in this text) in SB XX 15008.12, seemingly a partly requisitioned stable block with spaces still vacant on upper floors and available for the owner to let. This is a typical late formation, like *ἀνωνοκάπιτον*: cf. J. R. Rea, *ΖΡΕ* 114 (1996) 162–3; on its Latin termination see L. R. Palmer, *Grammar of the Post-Ptolemaic Papyri* 45–6.

10–11 τὸς μιτάτορας . . . ἀλύπους ποιῶ. There is a similarity here to the passage in Gascou's first inscription, *Trav. et Mém.* 12 (1994) 331 Texte I.9–11 εἰς οἴκησιν τῶν εἰσερχομένων στρατιωτῶν εἰς ἀμεριμνίαν τε τῶν ἐρευθερικῶν (l. ἐλευ-) μιτάτων, 'for the accommodation of incoming soldiers and for the relief of the billets provided by townspeople(?)'; see Gascou's commentary. The passages differ of course in that Gerontius claims to be keeping the billeting officers free of annoyance by not demanding accommodation for his own personnel, while the Thebaid military authorities claim to be building their hostel for the benefit of the travelling soldiers and to save annoyance to the local providers of billets.

31 ξένων. These ξένοι seem to be the same as, or at least include, the soldiers mentioned before, who had been billeted in houses belonging to the writer or his associates (18–20). This is very reminiscent again of the twin inscriptions revised by Gascou, art. cit. (above, 10 n., 10–11 n.). One face of the slab, the earlier according to the convincing arguments of Gascou, commemorates the building of a hostel or *mansio*, ἀπαντητήριον, for the accommodation of visiting 'soldiers', εἰς οἴκησιν τῶν εἰσερχομένων στρατιωτῶν. The other face commemorates the clearance of a building site, probably the same site at a later date as Gascou argues, on the initiative of the local commander and his subordinate officers and probably by local troops, and the rebuilding, by the local populace on the initiative of the local bishop, of an οἴκη[τ]ήρ[ι]ον τῶν ξένων καὶ τῶν παρερχομένων, 'a hostel for visitors and passing travellers'. There can hardly be any doubt that these are persons entitled to official accommodation, in other words troops, officials, and civilians whose business has been judged to be important enough to the government to justify the issue to them of an official travel warrant. Similarly in our text *στρατιῶται* is used for convenience to cover real military personnel and the *militia officialis*, and others with a travel warrant, and the same group is referred to as ξένοι.

32 δομεστικοῦ. The *domesticus* was the personal assistant of a military officer; see P. Abinn., p. 28. For this and the more exalted categories of *domestici* see A. H. M. Jones, *LRE* II 602–3, 636–40. The only example of the word in the Duke databank that is anywhere near contemporary with **4628** is P. Abinn. 25.11.

33–4 τὴν ἀναχώρησιν. It is not clear in what sense this word should be taken. If it referred to the annual retreat of the Nile flood in late September—cf. Diodorus Siculus I 10.7 (cited in LSJ: τοῦ ποταμοῦ (i.e. the Nile) τὴν ἀναχώρησιν ποιουμένου; for a documentary parallel cf. P. Petr. II 13 fr. 19.9)—it would not be clear why this should impede Gerontius' movement. This would be precisely the period in which navigation once more became practicable. However, the same word might well have been used of the later stages of the same process at the start of the following summer, when the falling level of the river certainly placed restrictions on travel by water: cf. LVI **3860** 11–14 (1 Mecheir = 26/27 January) πέμψωσιν μοι ἀντά, ἕως ἐνὶ ὕδαρ εἰς τὴν διώρυγαν. ἐὰν δὲ διαβῶσιν οἱ δύο μῆνες οὗτοι, οὐκ εὐρίσκουσιν ὕδαρ εἰς τὴν διώρυγα καὶ οὐκέτι δύναντε καταβῆνε ὄδε; probably the same situation (*pace* edd.) in XVIII **2182** 30–2 (24 Pharmuthi = 19 April) (ε)ἰς τὸ ἔτι τοῦ ποταμοῦ πλείεσθαι δυναμένου τὴν καταγωγὴν γενέσθαι ἤδη μὲν τοῦ ὕδατος ὑπονοστούντος.

It may be that τὴν ἀναχώρησιν is no more than a reference to a journey by Gerontius from Oxyrhynchus itself out to the countryside, which made a return to the city inconvenient.

R. MAZZA

#### 4629. LETTER TO A COUNTESS

64 6B.59/C (1–3) a

15.5 × 14.5 cm

Sixth/seventh century  
Plate IV

This almost square papyrus is used for a letter written *transversa charta* (a horizontal



kollesis is visible between the third and the fourth line). The back, along the fibres, provides the address as well as three more lines which end the letter, parallel to the address but the other way up. The main text is written in a large, sloping and almost unligatured script, resembling LVI 3866 and G. Cavallo and H. Maehler, *Greek Bookhands of the Early Byzantine Period* no. 31b, and may be assigned to the second half of the sixth century, if not slightly later. The address shows a different script, formal and stylized, comparable to the address of LVI 3867.

This initially personal letter is however mainly concerned with business matters, in particular with instructions on obtaining amounts of honey, money and wool from different people. From the use of *οὖν* in 6 it looks as if these new arrangements were prompted by the failure of a plan to have the goods sent by boat (3–5). An interesting feature is the title *κομήτις*, given in the address, since this is the first occurrence of the word in a papyrus document.

↓ † πρὸ μὲν πάντων πολλὰ προσκυνῶ  
 τῇ σῇ γλυκυτάτῃ μου μητρὶ μετὰ παντὸς  
 τοῦ οἴκου μου. περὶ δὲ τοῦ πλοίου τοῦ κυρίου  
 Ἰωάννου πολλάκις ἔπεμψα πρὸς αὐτὸν  
 5 καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκέν μοι ἀπόκρισιν. παρακα-  
 λῶ οὖν τῇ σῇ μητριότητι — ἰδοὺ ἀπέστιλά σοι  
 τὸν Εὐτύχιον μαῦρον — πάντος, ὡς ποιήσης  
 τὸ ἐσών, καὶ τὸ ἐμὸν ποιήσον· περὶ δὲ  
 τοῦ ἐνὸς νομίματος μέλιτος παρα-  
 10 λαβεῖν διὰ Πανηοῦτος Πευαρ· καὶ περὶ  
 τῶν δύο νομισμάτων τῶν ὠφιλό-  
 ντων, λαβεῖν παρὰ Ἀμμωνος υἱοῦ  
 Κάρου· καὶ περὶ τῶν δύο μνᾶς ἐρέας  
 παρακαλῶ ζητῆσαι παρὰ Λιμενίου καὶ  
 15 αὐτὰ πέμψον μοι. γράψον [[δ]]μοι δὲ τὴν

Back, other way up:

→ ὑγίαν ὑμῶν καὶ τοῦ κυρίου Σαραπίωνος  
 καὶ τοῦ κυρίου Μαρτυρίου. πολλὰ  
 προσκυνῶ †

Back, turned 180°:

→ (m. 2?) † ἐπίδ(οσ) τῇ . . . . τ(άτη) κυρᾶ κομητίσση π(αρά) κυρᾶς . . . .  
 20 να . . .

4 ἰωαννου      6 ἴδου    1. ἀπέστειλα (c corr. from λ)      7 1. πάντως, ποιήσεις?      8 1. κόν      9 εἶδος  
 10 πεῦαρ      11, 13 δῶο      11–12 1. ὀφειλομένων?      12 νίου      13 μῦας; 1. μῶν      15 1. αὐτάς  
 16 ὕγιαν? 1. ὑγίαιαν    ὕμων      19 ἐπιΔ<sup>ς</sup> π

‘First of all I greet my sweetest mother many times, along with my entire household. Concerning the boat of the lord John, I often sent to him and he gave me no answer. So I ask your Motherhood—see, I have sent Euty chius the black man to you—at all costs, as you would do your own business, do also mine. Concerning the one solidus’ worth of honey, get it through Paneous (alias? or the son of?) Peuar. Concerning the two solidi which are owing(?), collect them from Ammon, the son of Carus, and concerning the two minae of wool, please seek them from Limenius and send them to me. Write to me about’ (back) ‘your health and that of the lord Sarapion and the lord Martyrius. I send many greetings.’

Address (2nd hand?): ‘Deliver to the . . . lady countess, from the lady(?) . . .’

1 πρὸ μὲν πάντων πολλὰ προσκυνῶ is a common opening of Greek letters, and cf. also Coptic letters (Mich. III 10 **ⲗⲁⲐⲐ ⲘⲎⲎ ⲛ̅ⲗⲱⲘ ⲛⲓⲘ ⲛ̅ⲫⲣⲟⲤⲕⲩⲛⲎ**; Mich. IV 4 **ⲘⲠⲠⲓ ⲘⲎⲎ ⲛ̅ⲫⲣⲟⲤⲕⲩ**).

2 The sequence and dative are odd (the accusative is expected, as it is after παρακαλῶ in 6). γλυκυστάτη μήτηρ may sometimes function as a general polite form of address, but the adjective is more commonly used among relatives, cf. H. Koskenniemi, *Studien zur Idee und Phraseologie des griechischen Briefes bis 400 n. Chr.* (1956) 103. We suspect that the writer intended τὴν εἴην γλυκυστάτην μητρι(ότητα) (cf. line 6), but conflated (also wrongly using the dative) τῇ εἴη γλυκυστάτη μητριότητι and τῇ γλυκυστάτη μου μητρί.

2–3 μετὰ παντὸς τοῦ οἴκου μου. Cf. P. Herm. 43.5.

6 τῇ εἴη μητριότητι: 1. τὴν εἴην μητριότητα. \*μητριότης has not been attested before. On feminine abstracts in -οτης see L. R. Palmer, *Grammar* 115–6, including πατριότης (examples in P. Lond. VI 1916.32, P. L. Bat. XI 28). Most are formed from 2nd decl. adjectives, e.g. πατριότης from πάτριος; therefore μητριότης from μήτριος is unexceptionable. (μετριότης cannot be meant, since it is commonly used not as a form of address but as a speaker’s reference to the self; cf. P. Panop. 29.11 n.)

7 The adjective μαῦρος may simply indicate Euty chius’ dark skin colour: cf. A. Jördens, *ZPE* 92 (1992) 229 line 3 n.; A. Lajtar, *JJP* 27 (1997) 43–54, esp. 45 and n. 9. At so late a date it is unlikely that Euty chius was one of the *Mauri Scutarii*, for whom cf. **4628** 9–10 n. For Euty chius’ possible function as a mailman sent in connection with the letter, who is supposed to take the reply and the goods back with him, cf. P. Ross. Georg. V 12d (VII) ]ον στέλλω ὑμῖν μετὰ πάσης εὐχαριστίας | ]ως τοὺς δύο γραμματηφόρους μ[αύ]ρους.

The order τὸν Εὐτύχιον μαῦρον is unexpected, and hardly to be justified by the order in P. Ross. Georg. V 12d just cited, where γραμματηφόρους may be the adjective and μ[αύ]ρους the noun.

For ποιήεις = ποιήσεις and the use of the future in such expressions, cf. LIX **4003** 4–6 and n.

8 ἐcón (ἐcón pap.). For this spelling of cón cf. Gignac, *Grammar* ii. 172.

9 ἐνός is marked by a supralinear horizontal stroke, as if to characterize it as a number. The same appears in line 11 and 13 where the word δύο is similarly marked. Lines added above numerals written out in full are not unusual in Greek and Coptic documents of the late Byzantine and early Arab periods; cf. e.g. XVI **1968** 1 (VI), LVIII **3938** 17 (601), P. Mich. XIII 665.9, *et passim* (613–41), XVI **1939** 4 (VI/VII), SB XX 15186.3, 4, 5 (VII/VIII), P. Rain. Cent. 121.5 (719/20), or the Coptic CPR IV 46 (VI/VII).

10 Peuar is Paneous’ patronymic or alias. The name is attested in Greek and Coptic texts in the forms Πουάρ, Πουάρης, Πεύρις, ΠΟΥΑΡ: cf. D. Foraboschi, *Onomasticon Alterum Papyrologicum* s.v.v.; W. E. Crum, *Coptic Dictionary* 510b; G. Heuser, *Die Personennamen der Kopten* i. 31, 32, 73. It consists of the masculine article π(ε) and the word ΟΥΖΟΡ (spelled ΟΥΖΑΡ e.g. in the Coptic dialect M (Oxyrhynchite)), which stems from the Egyptian *whr* ‘dog’. The second consonant ζ (ΟΥ has consonantal value; cf. W. C. Till, *Koptische Grammatik* (1966) § 89) is a weakly articulated *h* and may sometimes be omitted; cf. Till, § 22. Before a noun beginning with two consonants we

should normally have the fuller form of the article (cf. Till, § 88), that is **πϵ** (sing. masc.) in our case; but since **ζ** can be omitted, the name commonly appears in a form which employs the shorter version of the article (**ΠΟΥΑΡ**). Here, however, the fuller form of the article has been used, with the result that **ϵ** and **ΟΥ** have been contracted to **ϵΥ**; cf. Till, §§ 19, 91.

The line above the name indicates that the word was not Greek; this practice is well attested, cf. P. Berl. Sarisch. 14.5 n.

11–12 An alternative approach to *ὀφειλόντων* (*ὠφιλόνητων* pap.) would be to link it with the following infinitive in an idiomatic construction as periphrastic future; see N. Gonis, *Tyche* 13 (1998) 260. However, *λαβείν* would be awkward (where we would rather expect *λημφθήναι*), while the construction beyond would raise fresh problems.

13 *μν̄ᾱς* (l. *μν̄ων*). The **ν** is marked by a supralinear horizontal line; might that be an influence from Coptic writing?

15 *γράφον* [[δ]]μοι. Apparently the scribe was about to write *δέ* but then decided to put *μοι* first.

17–18 *πολλὰ προσκυνῶ*. This formula is infrequently found at the closure of Greek letters: cf. XVI **1829** and **1865**, LVI **3867** 21, CPR XIV 51. In Coptic letters, however, the **ΠΡΟΣΚΥΝΕΙ**-formula occurs fairly frequently at the end of a letter; cf. A. Biedenkopf-Ziehner, *Untersuchungen zum koptischen Briefformular unter Berücksichtigung ägyptischer und griechischer Parallelen* (1983) 95.

19 The address, written in a stylized address script (cf. LVI **3867** introd. and plate VIII) but perhaps without a change of writer, is obscured by mud and dirt as well as surface abrasion. A reconstruction cannot be given with certainty. The addressee is styled *κομήτις*, a title attested only in literary sources of the Byzantine period. See J. Beaucamp, *Le statut de la femme à Byzance (4<sup>e</sup>-7<sup>e</sup> siècle)* ii (1992) 311–2. According to the lexica of Lampe and Sophokles, she was the wife of a *κόμης*. On *-ίς* see Palmer, op. cit. 93. The sender of the letter appears also to be a woman. As parallels suggest (cf. P. Lond. V 1885.7 (V/VI), 1789.6 (VI), LVIII **3932** 15 (VI), P. Sorb. I 62.6 (VI)), we should expect something like *ἐπίδ(ος) τῆ γλυκυτ(άτη)* (vel sim.) *κυρᾶ* (or *Κύρα*) *κομητίσση π(αρά) κυρᾶς* (or *Κύρας*) and her name or position.

G. SCHENKE

## VI. SCHOLIA MINORA TO HOMER, ILIAD II

Numbers in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* series have been allocated in advance to the items listed below, which have been edited by Dr Joseph Spooner for publication in *Studi e Testi di Papirologia* NS vol. I (Firenze).

<b>4630</b>	<i>Scholia minora</i> to II 24-40 (?55)	72/19(a)
<b>4631</b>	<i>Scholia minora</i> to II 50-109	51 4B.18/H(1-3)a
<b>4632</b>	<i>Scholia minora</i> to II 214-27	19 2B.82/K(a)
<b>4633</b>	<i>Scholia minora</i> to II 277-318 (294-306 in lacuna)	70/39(a)
<b>4634</b>	<i>Scholia minora</i> to II 303-36	19 2B.81/C(t)
<b>4635</b>	<i>Scholia minora</i> to II 303-28 (308-20 in lacuna) and 463-93 (471-8 in lacuna)	66 6B.28/F(1)b + 68 6B.19/J(1-3)f
<b>4636</b>	<i>Scholia minora</i> to II ?593-645	31 4B.13/K(1-2)a
<b>4637</b>	<i>Scholia minora</i> to II ?632-55	49 5B.100/H(1-2)b
<b>4638</b>	<i>Iliad</i> II 191-287 (227-53 in lacuna) with marginal gloss and speaker indications	9 1B.181/E(c)

# INDEXES

Figures in small raised type refer to fragments, small roman numerals to columns. Square brackets indicate that a word is wholly or substantially restored by conjecture or from other sources, round brackets that it is expanded from an abbreviation or a symbol. An asterisk denotes a word not recorded in *LSJ* or its *Revised Supplement*. The article is not indexed.

## I. ORACULAR TEXTS

### *SORTES ASTRAMPSYCHI* (4581)

- ἀγαθός 5b.1, 8a.6  
ἀγοράζω [1a.1], 1b.1, 2a.5, 2b.16, 3a.13, 3b.[2], 8, 4a.11  
ἀγωνίαν 4b.12, 5b.10, 6b.2  
ἀδελφή 5b.5, 6b.13  
ἀδελφός 5b.17, 6a.26  
Ἀλεξάνδρεια 5a.3, 11, 6a.17  
ἀληθώς 6b.17  
ἄλλα 3b.16  
ἄλλο 2b.22  
ἄμε- 7b.13  
ἀνακαθ- 6b.5, 8b.9  
ἀνεμποδίτως 5a.8  
ἀπαλλάσσειν 1b.4, 2a.2, 2b.19, 3b.11, 17, 4a.12, 14  
ἀπαρτίζω 1b.7, 3b.14, 4b.18  
ἀπέρχεσθαι 6a.30  
ἀπό 2a.8, 19, 3b.5  
ἀποδημῆν 3a.16, 4a.2  
ἀπόδημος 2a.9, 2b.7, 3b.6, 4b.16  
ἀποδιδόναι 2b.8, 9  
ἀποκαθιστάναι 1a.4, 2a.12, 24, 4b.21  
ἀπολαμβάνειν 5b.12, 6b.8?  
ἀπολλύναι 3a.1, 4a.21, 4b.23  
ἀπολύειν 2b.12, 4a.7, 6b.4, 8b.7  
ἀποθνήσκειν 4b.16  
ἀργύριον 1a.2, 2a.10, 21, 3b.7  
ἄρτι 1a.2, [1b.11], 2b.6, 8, 3a.17, 3b.7, 8, 4a.4, 5a.5  
ἀρχιατρός 5a.4, 6a.18  
ἄρχω 3a.6, 4b.8  
ἀσθένεια 2b.21, [4a.14]  
ἀσφαλίζω 2a.1, 6b.2, 8a.8  
ἀτυχεῖν 3b.16
- βίοπρασος 2a.4, 3b.1  
βλάπτειν 3a.11, 18, 4b.2  
βοηθεῖν [1b.9]
- βουλευτής 3a.19  
βραδέως 2b.9, 5b.6, 6a.18
- γαμῆν 3a.12  
γάμος [5a.7], 6a.21, 8a.9  
γένεαι 5b.21  
γεννᾶν 2b.4, 2b.10, 4b.13  
γῆρας 5b.15, 6a.24  
γίνεσθαι 1b.5, 2a.4, [2b.20], 3a.19, [3b.1], 12, 4a.9, [5a.9]  
γονεύς [4a.20]  
γράμμα [1b.11]  
γυνή [1b.3], 2a.2, 2b.13, 18, [3a.12], 3b.10, 17, 19, [4a.8, 13], 16, 4b.24, [5a.13], 5b.7, 6b.18
- δανείζω 2b.9, 5b.2, 6b.11, 7b.15?  
δαπανᾶν 6b.4, 8b.8  
δέ 2b.9, 3a.11, 5b.22?, 6a.18, 21, 24  
δεκάπρωτος 1b.5, 2b.20, 3b.12  
διαλλάττειν 8b.10  
διαβάλλειν 7b.1  
διδόναι 1b.11, 2b.6, 5a.8, 6a.22, 6b.9  
δίκη 3b.20, 4a.17  
δραμός 2a.3  
δύνασθαι 1a.5, 1b.6, [4b.8], 5a.9
- εἶν 3a.18, 4a.21, 4b.17, 5a.4  
εἶδέναι 3a.12  
εἶναι 5a.4, 6a.18, 6b.17, 7a.13  
εἰς 1a.4, 2a.12, 24, 4b.21, 5a.3, 10, 6a.17, 24  
ἐκ 3a.10, 4b.15  
ἐκδιδόναι 6b.6  
ἐλευθεροῦν 2b.2, [4b.11]  
ἐλπίζω 5b.4, 18, 23  
ἐπις 4a.22  
ἐν 2b.2, 5b.11, 6a.20, 7a.9

- ἐνδόξως 3a.6  
 ἐνθυμείσθαι [1a.1], 2a.5, 3b.2, 8a.9  
 ἐξαπίτης 3a.16, 4a.2, 5a.10  
 ἐπί 2a.6, 3a.14, 4a.10, 5b.2, 15, 6b.11  
 ἐπιβάλλειν 1b.7, 3b.14, 4b.18  
 ἐπικινδύνως 4b.19  
 ἐπίκλησις 4a.23  
 ἐπις- 5b.19  
 ἐπιτυγχάνειν 5b.15, 6a.21, 24  
 ἔργασία 4a.5  
 ἔρχεσθαι 2a.9, 2b.7, 3b.6, 7a.7  
 ἔσχατος 3a.4, 14, 4b.6  
 ἕτερος 1a.5, 2a.7, 3a.11  
 ἐτοιμάζειν 3a.20  
 εὐκαρπεῖν 5b.3  
 εὕρισκεν 2a.6, 3a.1, 5, 3b.3, [4b.7]  
 εὐτυχεῖν 3a.14  
 ἐφορᾶν 5b.6, 6b.14  
 ἔχειν 2b.3, 3a.3, 4, [3b.13, 17], 4a.5, 22, 26, [4b.6],  
 [5b.5], 6a.26, 6b.10, 13, 7b.1, 6, 8  
 ἐχθρός 5b.6, 6b.14  
  
 ζῆν 2a.9, [4b.13], 6b.3  
  
 θάνατος 4a.26  
 θέλειν 3a.12, [4a.13], 5a.12, 6a.9?, 6b.5, 7, 8b.4?, 9  
 θεωρεῖν [3b.13], (4a.26)  
 θορυβεῖν 5a.16  
  
 ἱερονίκης [2b.14], 4a.9  
  
 καί 2a.9, 2b.10, 3a.2, 12, 15, 3b.6  
 κακός 7a.13  
 καλός 3a.4, 4b.6, 5a.7, 6a.21, 6b.10  
 καλῶς 4a.3, 6a.28  
 καρπωνεῖν 3a.2  
 κατὰ 2a.22, 5b.21  
 καταδεῖν 6b.16  
 καταλαμβάνειν 2b.15?, 4a.10  
 καταλλάσσειν 1b.10, 2b.13, 4a.8, 24  
 κατηγορία 2b.5, 4b.14  
 κατοικεῖν 6a.20  
 κερδαίνειν 2a.8, 19, 3a.11, 15, 3b.5  
 κέρδος 2a.6  
 κίνδυνος 3a.9  
 κινεῖν 3a.10  
 κληρονομεῖν 2b.1, 3a.7, 8, [3b.19], 4a.16, [20], [4b.1,  
 9], 10  
 κωινωεῖν 3a.18, 4a.3  
  
 κομιᾶτον 1a.3, 2a.11, 23  
 κοπιάζειν 5b.12, 8b.10  
 κόπος 4b.15, 6a.22  
 κτᾶσθαι 2a.7  
 κύριος [1b.10]  
  
 λαμβάνειν 1a.2, [3, 9, 10], 1b.8, 2a.10, 11, 21, 23, 3b.7,  
 15, 4a.13, 19, 5a.5, 6a.10, 19  
 λανθάνειν 2a.3  
 λέγειν [3b.20], 4a.17  
 λειτουργία 6b.4, 8b.7  
 ληγάτον 1b.8, 3b.15  
 λόγος 2b.6  
 λυπεῖν 7a.15  
  
 μανθάνειν 8a.10  
 μάτην 5b.16  
 μένειν 1a.8, 3b.21, 4a.18  
 μέρος 2a.22, 5a.19  
 μετὰ 3a.9, 6a.22  
 μετανοεῖν 6b.5  
 μετοικεῖν 5a.6  
 μετρίως 6a.24  
 μή 1b.11, 3a.21, 4b.12, 5b.10, [6b.3], 5, 13, 7b.13, 8b.9  
 μήτηρ 3a.7, 4b.9  
 μισθοῦν [4b.2]  
 μοιχεία [4a.10]  
 μοιχός 2b.15?  
  
 ναυαγεῖν 4b.17  
 ναυλοῦν 5a.11  
 νικᾶν 3b.20, 4a.17, 27  
 νοσεῖν 7a.6, 7b.16  
 νῦν 2b.11, 4a.1, 4b.1, 8, 22, 6a.21  
  
 οἰκία 2b.16, 7a.9  
 οἰκοδομεῖν 4b.22  
 ὀλίγος 3b.15, 7a.6  
 ὄπου [1a.8], 3b.15  
 ὄραν 1b.6, 5b.5, [6b.3], 13, 7b.4, 8b.6  
 ὅς [1a.1, 2], 1b.7, 2a.5, 2b.8, 3a.12, 3b.2, 14, 4a.13, 4b.18,  
 5a.12, 6b.5, 7, 17, 8b.9  
 ὅτε 5b.17  
 οὐ [1a.1, 5, 8], 1b.[1, 2], 3, 6, 7, 8, [10], 2a.[2], 5, [11],  
 12, 23, 24, 2b.[1, 3], 8[11, 13, 15, 22], 3a.5, 8, 13, 17,  
 21, 3b.[7, 10], 11, [16, 17], 18, [20], 4a.1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 13,  
 15, 19, 22, 25, 27, 4b.[1, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14], 22, 5a.5, 7,  
 9, 13, 15, 16, 5b.3, 8, 16, [18], 22?, 23, 6a.[10, 12, 16],  
 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, 29, 6b.15, 16, 7b.5, 9

- οὐδέν 3b.8  
 οὐ̄πω 5a.1, 2, 17  
 ὀφείλειεν 2b.8  
 ὀφφίκιον 5b.11  
 ὀψώνιον 1a.9
- παιδεύειν 6b.8, 8a.11  
 παιδίον 6a.2, 6b.6  
 παραβόλιον 4a.21  
 παραθήκη 1a.10  
 παραμένειν 1b.2, 3, [2b.17, 18], 3b.9, 10, 5a.12  
 πάσχειν 6a.29  
 πατήρ 2b.1, 3a.8, 4b.10  
 πατρίς 1b.6, 3b.13, 6a.20  
 πεζεύειν 5a.14, [5b.8]  
 πίστις 4a.22  
 πλέειν 2b.11, 4a.6, 4b.17, 5a.3, 14, 5b.8, 6a.17  
 πολὺς 6a.22  
 πορεύεσθαι 5a.10  
 πράγμα 2a.8, 19, 3a.3, 3b.5  
 πραγματεία 2b.2, 4b.11  
 πράττειν 2b.22, 6a.27  
 πρεσβεύειν 3a.20, 4b.19  
 προασφαλίζειν 5a.15  
 προγράφειν 2a.7, 3b.4, 4b.20  
 προγυμν- 7b.14  
 προκίεσθαι 3a.13  
 προκόπτειν 3a.17, 4a.2, 5a.2  
 πρὸς 6b.6  
 πρόσωπον 6b.5, 8b.9  
 προτελευτᾶν 5a.13, 5b.7, 6b.15  
 πρῶτος 1b.3, 3b.10  
 πωλεῖν 2a.6, 3b.3
- ρήτωρ 5a.9
- σεαυτῷ [1b.9]  
 σιωπᾶν 4a.27  
 σός 2a.7, 3b.4, 4a.27, 4b.20, 5b.12, [6b.3], 7a.16, 8b.6  
 σοφιστεύειν 2b.22  
 στρατεύεσθαι 4a.4, 6a.16?, 23, 7a.4?, 7b.7, 10  
 στρατηγεῖν 4a.25  
 σύ [1b.2, 3], 2a.3, 2b.17, 18, 3b.9, 10, 21, 4a.18, 25, 26, 5a.1, 5b.2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 17, 22, 6a.12, 13, 16, [20], 23, 25, 26, 6b.12, 13, 14, 15, 16 (2), 7a.7, 9, 10, 11, 7b.4, [17], 8a.10  
 συκοφαντία 3b.18, 4a.15
- κύμβιος 6b.15, 7a.10  
 κυμφάριον 4a.25, 5a.1, 5b.2, 8, 14, 16, 6a.12, 13, 16, 17, 20, 23, 25, 7b.17, 8a.10  
 συν[ 5a.1  
 συναλλάσσειν 1a.5, 3a.15  
 συνέχειν 2b.12, 4a.7, 4b.23  
 συνοχή [4a.12]  
 σῶζειν 2b.4, 5, [21], [3b.18], 4a.15, [4b.14]
- ταχύ 6b.14  
 τέκνον 7a.17  
 τελείως 2a.4  
 τηρεῖν 8b.5  
 τι 2b.22  
 τιθέναι 4a.21  
 τίκειν 2b.10, 3a.9  
 τόπος 1a.4, 2a.12, 24, 3a.10, 4b.21  
 τρέφειν 4b.13
- ὑβρίζειν 2b.3, 4b.12  
 υἱός 5a.9  
 ὑπάγειν [1a.8]  
 ὑπάρχειν 3b.21, 4a.18  
 ὑπό 7b.2  
 ὑποπτεύειν 6a.28
- φάρμακος 6b.17  
 φαρμακοῦν 1b.9, 2a.1, 3b.16  
 φερνή 4a.19  
 φθονεῖν 7b.2  
 φιλοπονεῖν [3a.2]  
 φίλος 4b.5  
 φύλη [1b.2, 4], 2b.17, 3b.9, 11, 4a.24, 5b.13, 6b.16, 7a.11  
 φόβος 5b.10  
 φυγαδεύειν 3a.21  
 φυγῶν 3a.5, 4b.7
- χάρις 6a.10  
 χειρόγραφον 5b.2, 6b.11  
 χρέμα 7a.3  
 χρονίζειν 2b.7  
 χρόνος 7b.6  
 χωρίον [1b.1], 2b.16, 5b.3, 6b.12, 7a.2
- ὥς 5b.3  
 ὠφέλεια 3a.3  
 ὠφελεῖν 3a.2

## II. RULERS AND REGNAL YEARS

## TIBERIUS

*Τιβέριος Καίσαρ Σεβαστός* **4582** 9 (year 2) **4582** 11 (year 3) **4588** 4–5, 14–15 (year 19) **4588** 7, 17 (year 20)

## CLAUDIUS

*Τιβέριος Κλαύδιος Καίσαρ Σεβαστός Γερμανικὸς Αὐτοκράτωρ* **4583** 10–11, 18–19 (year 6); **4583** 6 (oath, *Τιβέριος* only)

## ANTONINUS PIUS

*θεὸς Αἴλιος Ἀντωνῖνος* **4585** 20 (year 10, retrospective reference)

## MARCUS AURELIUS

*Αὐρήλιος Ἀντωνῖνος* **4589** 18–19 (year 14)

*Αὐρήλιος Ἀντωνῖνος Καίσαρ ὁ κύριος* **4589** 13–14 (year 13), 29–30 (year 10), 35–6 (year 11), 41–2 (year 12)

*Μάρκος Αὐρήλιος Ἀντωνῖνος Σεβαστός* **4589** 24–5 (year 9)

## MARCUS AURELIUS AND VERUS

*Αὐρήλιοι Ἀντωνῖνος καὶ Οὐῆρος οἱ κύριοι Σεβαστοί* **4589** 2–3, 9–10 (year 8)

## MARCUS AURELIUS AND COMMODUS

*Αὐρήλιος Ἀντωνῖνος καὶ Λούκιος Αὐρήλιος Κόμμοδος Σεβαστοί* **4587** 3–4 (year 19)

## COMMODUS

*Αὐτοκράτωρ Καίσαρ Μάρκος Αὐρήλιος Κόμμοδος Ἀντωνῖνος Εὐσεβῆς Εὐτυχῆς Σεβαστός Ἀρμενιακὸς Μηδικὸς Παρθικὸς Καρματικὸς Γερμανικὸς Μέγιστος Βρετανικὸς* **4585** 28–33 (year 29)

*Αὐτοκράτωρ Κόμμοδος Ἀντωνῖνος Καίσαρ ὁ κύριος* **4585** 26–7 (oath formula)

## SEVERUS

*Κεου[ῆ]ρος* **4593** 14 (year 9)

## SEVERUS AND CARACALLA

*οἱ κύριοι ἡμῶν ἀήττητοι Αὐτοκράτορες Κεουῆρος καὶ Ἀντωνῖνος* **4593** 6–7

*Αὐτοκράτωρ Καίσαρ Λούκιος Σεπίμιος Κεουῆρος Εὐσεβῆς Περτίναξ Σεβαστός Ἀραβικὸς Ἀδιαβηνικὸς Παρθικὸς Μέγιστος καὶ Αὐτοκράτωρ Καίσαρ Μάρκος Αὐρήλιος Ἀντωνῖνος Εὐσεβῆς Σεβαστός* **4593** 1–2

## SEVERUS ALEXANDER

*Μάρκος Αὐρήλιος Κεουῆρος Ἀλέξανδρος Καίσαρ ὁ κύριος* **4590** 2–3, 9–10, 17–18 (year 10)

## MACRIANUS AND QUIETUS

*Αὐτοκράτορες Καίσαρες Τίτος Φούλουιος Ἰούνιος Μακριανὸς καὶ Τίτος Φούλουιος Ἰούνιος Κυῆτος Εὐτυχεῖς Εὐσεβεῖς Σεβαστοί* **4595** 41–6 (year 2)

## DIOCLETIAN AND MAXIMIAN AUGUSTI, CONSTANTIUS AND GALERIUS CAESARS

*οἱ κύριοι ἡμῶν Διοκλητιανὸς καὶ Μαξιμιανὸς Σεβαστοί καὶ οἱ κύριοι ἡμῶν Κωνσταντίος καὶ Μαξιμιανὸς οἱ ἐπιφανέστατοι Καίσαρες Σεβαστοί* **4597** 25–7 (year 11, 10 and 3)



## CONSTANTIUS AUGUSTUS AND JULIAN CAESAR

οἱ δεσπότες ἡμῶν Κωνσταντίος αἰώνιος Αὔγουστος καὶ Ἰουλιανὸς ὁ ἐπιφανέστατος Καῖσαρ **4606** 6–7 (oath formula)

οἱ δεσπότες ἡμῶν Κωνσταντίος αἰώνιος Αὔγουστος καὶ Ἰουλιανὸς ὁ ἀνδρειότατος καὶ ἐπιφανέστατος Καῖσαρ **4598** 4–6 (oath formula)

## JULIAN

ὁ δεσπότης ἡμῶν Ἰουλιανὸς αἰώνιος Αὔγουστος **4608** 5–6 **4610** 7 **4612** i 6–7 (oath formula) **4611** i 3–4 (oath formula, restored)

## JOVIAN

ὁ δεσπότης ἡμῶν Ἰουλιανὸς αἰώνιος Αὔγουστος **4613** 6 (oath formula)

## III. CONSULS

AD 294 ὑπατείας τῶν κυρίων ἡμῶν Κωνσταντίου καὶ Μαξιμιανοῦ τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων Καισάρων **4597** 1–2

AD 361 ὑπατείας Φλαουῶν Ταύρου καὶ Φλωρεντίου τῶν λαμπροτάτων **4598** 1 **4600** 2 **4601** 2 **4602** 1–2 **4603** 1 **4604** 2 **4605** 2 **4606** 1

AD 362 ὑπατείας Κλαυδίου Μαμερτίνου καὶ Φλαουίου Νεβιέττα τῶν λαμπροτάτων **4608** 1 **4609** 1

AD 363 ὑπατείας τοῦ δεσπότη ἡμῶν Ἰουλιανοῦ αἰωνίου Αὔγουστου τὸ δ' καὶ Φλαουίου Καλλουστίου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου ἐπάρχου τοῦ ἱεροῦ πραιτωρίου **4610** 1–2 **4612** i 1–2 (damaged)

AD 364 ὑπατείας τοῦ δεσπότη ἡμῶν Ἰουλιανοῦ αἰωνίου Αὔγουστου [τὸ α'] καὶ Οὐαρρωνιανοῦ τοῦ ἐπιφανεστάτου **4613** 1

AD 505 ὑπατεία Φλαουῶν Καβινιανοῦ καὶ Θεοδώρου τῶν ἐνδοξοτάτων **4615** 2

AD 525 ὑπατείας Φλαουίου Φιλοξένου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου **4616** 1

## IV. INDICATIONS AND ERAS

## (a) INDICATIONS

4th indiction **4605** 7 (= AD 360/1) **4616** 1 (= AD 363/4)

5th indiction **4598** 9 **4599** 4 **4600** 8 **4604** 9 **4606** 8 (all AD 361/2) **4621** 3 (fifth/sixth century)

6th indiction **4607** i 7 **4608** 7 **4609** 7 **4611** ii 14 (all AD 362/3)

7th indiction **4611** ii 4 **4612** i 8, ii 4 **4613** 8, back 1 (all AD 363/4)

9th indiction **4620** 1 (fifth/sixth century)

14th indiction **4615** 2, 10 (= AD 505–6) **4623** 2 (late sixth century)

## (b) ERA

182/151 = AD 505/6 **4615** 9

## V. MONTHS AND DAYS

## (a) MONTHS

Ἀθύρ **4591** 8 **4597** 27 **4602** 2 **4622** 4

Γερμανίκεος **4624** 20

Δεκέμβριος **4593** 4

Ἐπεῖφ **4598** 1 **4605** 2

Θῶθ **4606** 1 **4615** 2

Μεσορή **4611** ii 17 **4612** ii 10 **4621** 3

Μεχέρ 4585 33

Παῦνι 4594 16 4600 2 4601 2 4610 2

Παχών 4627 16

Κεβαστός 4582 10 4583 11, 18 4588 8, 18

εἶδοί 4593 4

Τύβι 4596 10

Φαρμούθι 4592 13

Φαώφι 4595 46 4603 1 4616 1

Χοιάκ 4623 2

(b) Days

νεομηγνία 4596 9–10

VI. DATES

14 September 16 4582 10

26 September 33 4588 8, 18

15 September 45 4583 11, 18–19

18–22 November 231? 4591 4, 6–7, 8, 10

15 October 261 4595 46

19 November 294 4597 27

14 June 361 4600 2

22 June 361 4601 2

29 June 361 4605 2

10 July 361 4598 1

17 October 361 4603 1

13 June 363 4610 2

3 September 505 4615 2

30 September 525 4616 1

VII. PERSONAL NAMES

Ἀγαθῖνος h. of Ταῦσις, f. of Aurelius Amoïs 4594 4

Ἀγαθῖνος f. of Syradion 4607 ii 7

Ἀγαθῖνος f. of Aur. Petrus 4608 3 4609 3

Ἀγαθόπου 4626 11

Ἀγαθός Δαίμων 4626 15

Αἴλιος *see* Index II s.v. Antoninus Pius

Αἴλιος Πρίμος 4593 2

Ἀκύλας *see* Κουβατιανός Ἀκύλας

Ἀλέξανδρος 4590 6 (-rius alias A.)

Ἀλέξανδρος h. of Αρπία, f. of Aur. Polydeuces, gd.-f. of Aurelia Aphrodite 4596 2

Ἀλέξανδρος *see also* Φλάουῖος Ἀλέξανδρος, Index II s.v. Severus Alexander

Ἀμάϊς f. of Paulus 4611 ii 13

Ἀμηννεῦς f. of Horus, gd.-f. of Heracles 4588 1

Ἀμμων s. of Carus 4629 12

Ἀμμωνιανός 4607 ii 8

Ἀμμώνιος s. of Diogenes(?) 4589 [46]

Ἀμμώνιος f. of Ammonius 4586 6, 45

Ἀμμώνιος s. of Ammonius, h. of Philoxena 4586 5–6, 44–5 (Ἀμμῶνις)

Ἀμμώνιος *see also* Ἀνρήλιος Ἀμμώνιος

Ἀμόϊς s. of Horus 4588 9, 18

Ἀμόϊς *see also* Ἀνρήλιος Ἀμόϊς

Ἀνίκητος 4591 7

Ἀννιανός *tribunus* 4612 i 16

Ἀντίοχος h. of Sarapias 4607 iii 12

Ἀντωνῖνος 4626 2

Ἀντωνῖνος *see* Index II s.vv. Antoninus, Marcus Aurelius, Marcus Aurelius and Verus, Marcus Aurelius and Commodus, Commodus, Severus and Caracalla

Ἀντώνιος *see* Ἀνρήλιος Ἀντώνιος

Ἀπελλῆς *see* Κλαύδιος Ἀπελλῆς

Ἀπία w. of Alexander, m. of Aur. Polydeuces, gd.-m. of Aurelia Aphrodite 4596 2

Ἀπίων toprarch 4588 1, 11

Ἀπίων 4589 17, 23

Ἀπίων s. of Apolinarius 4607 iii 2

Ἀπίων s. of Sarapion 4607 iii 8

Ἀπίων f. of Aur. Ammonius 4608 3 4612 i 5

Ἀπίων f. of Fl. Strategius 4615 5

Ἀπολνάριος councillor 4592 verso

Ἀπολνάριος f. of Apion 4607 iii 2

Ἀπολλώνιος f. of Theodulus 4607 ii 10

Ἀπολλώνιος f. of Heliodora 4607 ii 6

Ἀπολλώνιος *amphodogrammateus* 4593 9

Ἀπολλώνιος *see also* Ἀνρήλιος Ἀπολλώνιος, Σεπτίμιος Ἀπολλώνιος

Ἀρθώνις 4585 2, 34

Ἀριστίων 4607 ii 14

Ἀριστοῦς w. of Paternuthius, m. of Aur. Demetrammon 4597 4

Ἀρποκρατίων alias Ischyron 4585 11–12

Ἀρσινόη 4607 ii 5

- Ἀρεΐνοος f. of Aur. Dorotheus **4608** 4 **4609** 4  
 Ἀσόχης s. of Peteÿris **4583** 2, 16  
 Ἀῦγουστος *see* Index II, III  
 Ἀὐρηλία Ἀφροδίτη d. of Aur. Polydeuces and Dionysia **4596** 7  
 Ἀὐρηλία Διονυσία d. of Theon alias Dionysiotheon **4595** 1–2  
 Ἀὐρηλία Ἡράκλεια d. of Diogenes **4590** 3–4, 19, 29  
 Ἀὐρηλία Τιαρία **4614** 3  
 Ἀὐρήλιος *see* Index II s.vv. Marcus Aurelius, Marcus Aurelius and Verus, Marcus Aurelius and Commodus, Commodus, Severus and Caracalla, Severus Alexander  
 Ἀὐρήλιος Ἀμμώνιος (former?) *agoranomus*, councillor **4590** 25  
 Ἀὐρήλιος Ἀμμώνιος s. of Apion, councillor, overseer of wheat/barley **4608** 3 **4612** i 5  
 Ἀὐρήλιος Ἀμοῖς s. of Agathinus and Ταΰσις **4594** 4  
 Ἀὐρήλιος Ἀντώνιος *silologus* **4590** 14  
 Ἀὐρήλιος Ἀπολλώνιος guardian **4595** 4–5  
 Ἀὐρήλιος Βίκτωρ s. of Isak and Martha, farmer **4616** 6  
 Ἀὐρήλιος Γεννάδιος s. of Julianus; councillor, overseer of barley **4610** 4(?), 16(?) **4613** 3  
 Ἀὐρήλιος Δημητράμμων s. of Paternuthius and Aristous **4597** 4, 6, 8, 13, 20  
 Ἀὐρήλιος Διογένης s. of Serenus **4594** 1  
 Ἀὐρήλιος Διοσκουρίδης alias Julianus(?), s. of Julianus (alias?) Dioscurides; councillor, overseer of wheat **4606** 3  
 Ἀὐρήλιος Δωρόθεος s. of Arsinous, councillor, overseer of wheat/barley **4608** 4 **4609** 4  
 Ἀὐρήλιος Εὐτρυγίος s. of Leucadius, former magistrate, councillor, *praepositus pagi*, *curialis* **4598** 3 **4599** 6, 9, 13, 16 **4600** 5 **4601** 7  
 Ἀὐρήλιος Ἡράκλειος s. of Heraclius, *πρόεδρος*, *prytanis* **4602** 4 **4603** 4 **4604** 5 **4605** 4  
 Ἀὐρήλιος Θῶνις Ἰετωνάρχης, s. of Pete- and Thaisous **4596** 3, 6, 12, 16, 18, 21, 25  
 Ἀὐρήλιος Ἰερακαπόλλων alias Epimachus, (former?) gymnasiarch, f. of Dionysius **4590** 11, 21  
 Ἀὐρήλιος Ἰέραξ s. of Saprion, councillor of Pelusium, overseer of the annona **4600** 3, 12  
 Ἀὐρήλιος Ἰέραξ s. of Julianus; councillor, overseer of barley **4610** 5  
 Ἀὐρήλιος Κλήμης s. of Clemens, councillor of Pelusium **4600** 4, 13  
 Ἀὐρήλιος Μαρρῆς(?) *chrysones*(?) **4604** 4, [15]  
 Ἀὐρήλιος Πετοσίρις *silologus* **4590** 24, 31  
 Ἀὐρήλιος Πέτρος s. of Agathinus, councillor, overseer of wheat/barley **4608** 3 **4609** 3  
 Ἀὐρήλιος Πλουτίων **4594** 2  
 Ἀὐρήλιος Πολυδεύκης s. of Alexander and Apia, h. of Dionysia, f. of Aurelia Aphrodite **4596** 1, 5, 17  
 Ἀὐρήλιος Πρόσις s. of Dionycasius, councillor of Pelusium, banker **4605** 3, 9, 10  
 Ἀὐρήλιος Ποτάμμων s. of Eutychiuss, former magistrate of Pelusium, *chrysones*(?) **4604** 4, [14]  
 Ἀὐρήλιος Πτολεμῖνος alias Sarmates, exegetes, councillor, conveyor of chaff **4597** 3, 5, 9, 14, 19, 22, 28  
 Ἀὐρήλιος Καραπίων s. of Plutarchus, councillor, overseer of wheat/barley **4606** 4, 19 **4608** 4, 15 **4609** 3–4 **4610** 5, 17 **4613** 4  
 Ἀὐρήλιος Καραπίων s. of Herm-, overseer of army supplies **4607** 2  
 Ἀὐρήλιος Καραπίων (councillor, overseer of barley) **4613** 16  
 Ἀὐρήλιος Κερῆνος s. of Eusebius, councillor, overseer of wheat/barley **4610** 5 **4612** i 4 **4613** 3, 14  
 Ἀὐρήλιος Τιμαγένης s. of Serenus, councillor, overseer of wheat/barley **4612** i 19 **4613** 4  
 Ἀὐρήλιος Τρύφων alias Diogenes **4590** 15  
 Ἀφθόνιος **4607** ii 3  
 Ἀφροδίτη w. of Stephanus, m. of Philotera **4589** 27, 33, 38, 44  
 Ἀφροδίτη *see also* Ἀὐρηλία Ἀφροδίτη  
 Βίκτωρ wine merchant **4621** 1  
 Βίκτωρ wine steward **4622** 1  
 Βίκτωρ *see also* Ἀὐρήλιος Βίκτωρ  
 Γαιανός **4607** iii 1  
 Γάιος *see* Τούλιος  
 Γεννάδιος *see* Ἀὐρήλιος Γεννάδιος  
 Γερόντιος **4628** 2  
 Γερόντιος s. of Posidonius **4607** iii 3  
 Γερόντιος s. of Paecianus **4611** ii 6, 15  
 Δημητράμμων *see* Ἀὐρήλιος Δημητράμμων  
 Δημήτριος **4584** 12–13  
 Δίδυμος **4589** (37)  
 Διογένης: C. Julius Diogenes **4587** 6  
 Διογένης steward **4591** 3  
 Διογένης: Aurelius Tryphon(?) alias Diogenes **4590** 15  
 Διογένης f. of Aurelia Heraclia **4590** 4, 19, 29  
 Διογένης **4582** 7, 17 **4594** 20  
 Διογένης f. of Ammonius(?) **4589** (47)  
 Διογένης *see also* Ἀὐρήλιος Διογένης

- Διοκλητιανός* see Index II s.v Diocletian and Maximian Augusti, Constantius and Galerius Caesars  
*Διονυκάσιος* f. of Aur. Posis **4605** 3  
*Διονυσία* w. of Aur. Polydeuces, m. of Aurelia Aphrodite **4596** 8  
*Διονυσία* see also *Αύρηλία Διονυσία*  
*Διονύσιος officialis* **4607** ii 13  
*Διονύσιος* former *beneficiarius* **4611** ii 7  
*Διονύσιος* s. of Aurelius Hieracapollon alias Epimachus **4590** 11  
*Διονύσιος* **4584** 4 **4590** 4  
*Διονυσόδωρος* **4607** iii 14  
*Διονυσοθέων*: Theon alias Dionysiotheon, f. of Aurelia Dionysia **4595** 3–4  
*Δίος* strategus **4584** 2  
*Δίος* gymnasiarch **4624** 1, 22  
*Διοσκοουρίδης*: Julianus (alias?) Dioscurides (ex-curator *civitatis*?), f. of Aur. Dioscurides alias Julianus(?) **4606** 3  
*Διοσκοουρίδης* see also *Αύρηλιος Διοσκοουρίδης*  
*Δυνάμιος* h. of Valentina **4607** ii 11  
*Δωρόθεος* see *Αύρηλιος Δωρόθεος*
- Ἐπίμαχος*: Aurelius Hieracapollon alias Epimachus, (former?) gymnasiarch, f. of Dionysius **4590** 11, 21–2  
*Ἐρμίας* **4589** 21  
*Ἐρμίας*: Theon alias Hermias, assistant **4589** 47  
*Ἐρμίας* former *praepositus* **4607** iii 9  
*Ἐκερσόεις* w. of Petemennophris, m. of Taonnophris **4586** 1–2  
*Ἐνάντιον* . . . of Aphthonius **4607** ii 3  
*Ἐνδαίμων* **4593** 6  
*Ἐνδαίμων* see also *Φλάουϊος Ἐνδαίμων*  
*Ἐνλόγιος* f. of Ptolemaeus **4607** iii 5  
*Ἐνσέβιος* f. of Aurelius Serenus **4610** 5 **4612** i 4 **4613** 3, 14  
*Ἐνσέβιος* f. of Theon **4613** 11, 13  
*Ἐντόλιμος* **4607** ii 1  
*Ἐντρόπιον* **4607** iii 19  
*Ἐντρύγιος* see *Αύρηλιος Ἐντρύγιος*  
*Ἐντύχιος* f. of Aurelius Potammon **4604** 4  
*Ἐντύχιος* black man **4629** 7
- Ζήνων* see *Φλάουϊος Ζήνων*  
*Ζωΐλος* f. of Macrobius **4607** iii 7  
*Ζωΐλος* f. of Philonicus **4611** ii 10  
*Ζωΐλος* assistant **4589** 28  
*Ζωΐλος* **4624** 9  
*Ζωΐς* **4584** 4, 13
- Ἥλιοδώρα* d. of Apollonius **4607** ii 6  
*Ἥνιοχος* f. of Horus **4588** 5  
*Ἥραϊς* d. of Ischyriion **4589** 19  
*Ἡράκλεια* see *Αύρηλία Ἡράκλεια*  
*Ἡρακλείδης* **4593** 20, 21  
*Ἡράκλειος* s. of Sarapion, beekeeper **4582** 2, 4  
*Ἡράκλειος* s. of Peteÿris **4583** 1, 14  
*Ἡράκλειος* f. of Aur. (Claudius) Heraclius **4602** 4 **4603** 4 **4604** 5 **4605** 4  
*Ἡράκλειος* see also *Αύρηλιος Ἡράκλειος*, *Κλαύδιος Ἡράκλιος*  
*Ἡρακλῆς* s. of Horus, gd.-s. of Amenneus **4588** 1  
*Ἡρακλῆς ὑδροπάροχος* **4591** 6, 7, 8  
*Ἡράκλιος* see *Ἡράκλειος*  
*Ἡρᾶς* **4625** 4  
*Ἡρόστρατος* strategus **4582** 1  
*Ἡρων* **4593** 16  
*Ἡρων* f. of Philoxena **4586** 5, 39
- Θαῆσις* **4589** 32  
*Θαῆσις* slave, m. of Peteÿris **4584** 14  
*Θαΐσοῦς* w. of Aur. Thonis **4596** 4  
*Θάλεια* **4626** 1, 17  
*Θεαγένης* **4624** 7  
*Θεοδοσία* w. of Patenyphius **4615** 6  
*Θεόδουλος* s. of Apollonius **4607** ii 10  
*Θεόδωρος* substitute and deputy **4614** 2  
*Θεόδωρος* **4607** iii 15  
*Θεόδωρος* see also *Φλάουϊος Θεόδωρος*  
*Θέων a numeris*, boat owner **4612** i 13  
*Θέων* s. of Eusebius, councillor, boat owner **4613** 11, 13  
*Θέων* alias Hermias, assistant **4589** 47  
*Θέων* alias Dionysiotheon, f. of Aurelia Dionysia **4595** 2–3  
*Θέων* gymnasiarch(?) **4582** 18  
*Θέων* **4612** ii 7  
*Θεωνίς* . . . of Eutolmius **4607** ii 1  
*Θώνις* **4584** 11  
*Θώνις* diviner **4584** 18  
*Θώνις* alias Morus, freedman **4585** 1, 34  
*Θώνις* s. of Paysiris **4586** 13  
*Θώνις* see also *Αύρηλιος Θώνις*
- Ἱερακαπόλλων* **4627** 1, 17  
*Ἱερακαπόλλων* see also *Αύρηλιος Ἱερακαπόλλων*  
*Ἱέραξ* see *Αύρηλιος Ἱέραξ*

- Ἰουλιανός *see* Index II s.v. Jovian, Index III  
 Ἰουλιανός (alias?) Dioscurides (*ex-curator civitatis?*), f. of Aur. Dioscurides alias Julianus(?) **4606** 3  
 Ἰουλιανός *ex-curator civitatis*, f. of Aur. Gennadius and Aur. Hierax **4610** 4, 16 **4613** 3  
 Ἰουλιανός: Aur. Dioscurides alias Julianus(?), s. of Julianus (alias?) Dioscurides; councillor, overseer of wheat **4606** 3  
 Ἰουλιανός: Aur. Julianus(?) **4606** 3  
 Ἰουλιανός *see also* Index II s.vv. Constantius Augustus and Julian Caesar, Julian; III  
 Ἰούλιος: C. Julius *x*, strategus **4583** 5  
 Ἰούλιος: C. Julius Diogenes **4587** 5–6  
 Ἰούλιος: C. Julius Leucadius, strategus of the Oxyrhynchite **4607** i 1 **4608** 2 **4609** 2 **4610** 3 **4612** i 3 **4613** 2  
 Ἰούνιος *see* Index II s.v. Macrianus and Quietus  
 Ἰσάκ h. of Martha, f. of Aur. Victor **4616** 6  
 Ἰσίδωρος: Claudius Appelles alias Isidorus, s. of Horion **4595** 6–7, 48  
 Ἰσχυρίων: Harpocraton alias Ischyron **4585** 12  
 Ἰσχυρίων f. of Heraïs **4589** 19  
 Ἰσχυρίων **4585** 8–9, 9–10, 17 **4600** 3  
 Ἰωάννης **4629** 4  
 Ἰώσηπος(?) s. of Timotheus **4611** back 2
- Καΐσαρ **4584** 22; *see also* Index II, III  
 Κάρος f. of Ammon **4629** 13  
 Κλαύδιος Ἀπελλῆς alias Isidorus, s. of Horion **4595** 6, 47  
 Κλαύδιος Ἡράκλιος **4602** 9 (cf. Aur. Heraclius)  
 Κλαύδιος Μαμερτίνος *vir clarissimus*, consul **4608** i **4609** 1  
 Κλήμης f. of Aur. Clemens **4600** 4, 14  
 Κλήμης *see also* Ἀυρήλιος Κλήμης  
 Κολλοῦθος *domesticus* **4628** 1  
 Κολλοῦθος f. of Ptolemaeus **4611** ii 8  
 Κόμμοδος *see* Index II s.vv. Marcus Aurelius and Commodus, Commodus  
 Κρησκέντιος *see* Φλάουῖος Κρησκέντιος  
 Κυήτος *see* Index II s.v. Macrianus and Quietus  
 Κωνσταντίος *see* Index II, III
- Λαΐτος (*praefectus Aegypti*) **4593** 17, 20  
 Λευκάδιος: C. Julius Leucadius, strategus of the Oxyrhynchite **4607** i 1 **4608** 2 **4609** 2 **4610** 3 **4612** i 3 **4613** 2  
 Λευκάδιος f. of Aurelius Eutrygius **4598** 3 **4599** 6, 13 **4600** 5 **4601** 7
- Λεωνίδης **4607** ii 4  
 Λιμένιος **4629** 14  
 Λούκιος *see* Index II s.vv. Marcus Aurelius and Commodus, Severus and Caracalla
- Μακριανός *see* Index II s.v. Macrianus and Quietus  
 Μακρόβιος s. of Zoilus **4607** iii 7  
 Μαμερτίνος *see* Κλαύδιος Μαμερτίνος  
 Μαξιμιανός *see* Index II, III  
 Μάξιμος (*praefectus Aegypti?*) **4583** 8  
 Μάξιμος **4625** 1, 10  
 Μάρθα w. of Isak, m. of Aur. Victor **4616** 6  
 Μάρκος *see* Index II s.vv. Marcus Aurelius, Commodus, Severus and Caracalla, Severus Alexander  
 Μαρρής(?) *see* Ἀυρήλιος Μαρρής  
 Μαρτύριος **4629** 17  
 Μηνάς οἰκέτης **4616** 4  
 Μουχῆ **4612** i 15  
 Μῶρος: Thonis alias Morus, freedman **4585** 1, 34
- Νεβιέττα *see* Φλάουῖος Νεβιέττα  
 Νεῖλος **4626** 1, 17
- Ὀνωφρις s. of Sarapion **4582** 2  
 Ὄρεῆς s. of Horus **4583** 2, 15  
 Οὐαλεντῖνα w. of Dynamius **4607** ii 11  
 Οὐῆρος *see* Index II s.v. Marcus Aurelius and Verus  
 Ὀφέλλιος **4625** 1, 10
- Παιάνιος f. of Gerontius **4611** ii 6, 15  
 Παμοῦνις f. of Pamunis **4586** 2, 35  
 Παμοῦνις s. of Pamunis, priest **4586** 2, 35  
 Πανηοῦς **4629** 10  
 Πατενούφιος h. of Theodosia **4615** 6  
 Πατερμούθιος h. of Aristous, f. of Aur. Demetrammon **4597** 4  
 Παῦλος s. of Amaïs **4611** ii 13  
 Πανσίρις f. of Thonis **4586** 13  
 Περτίναξ *see* Index II s.v. Severus and Caracalla  
 Πετεμενωφρις h. of Esersois, f. of Taonmophris **4586** 1, 31  
 Πετεῦρις s. of Peteÿris **4583** 2, 13  
 Πετεῦρις f. of Heraclius, Totoës and Peteÿris **4583** 1, 12, 13, 14  
 Πετεῦρις f. of Hasychis **4583** 2, 16  
 Πετεῦρις slave, s. of Thaesis **4584** 10  
 Πετεῦρις **4584** 13  
 Πετοσίρις f. of Petosiris **4589** 26  
 Πετοσίρις s. of Petosiris **4589** 26

- Πετοσίρις *see also* *Αυρήλιος Πετοσίρις*  
*Πέτρος see* *Αυρήλιος Πέτρος*  
*Πευαρ 4629* 10  
*Πικβκ()* farmer **4590** 12  
*Πλούταρχος* f. of Aur. Sarapion **4606** 4, 19 **4608** 4, 15  
**4609** 4 **4612** 5, 17 **4613** 4  
*Πλουτίων see* *Αυρήλιος Πλουτίων*  
*Πολυδεύκης see* *Αυρήλιος Πολυδεύκης*  
*Ποσιδώνιος* f. of Gerontius **4607** iii 3  
*Πόσις see* *Αυρήλιος Πόσις*  
*Ποτάμμων see* *Αυρήλιος Ποτάμμων*  
*Πρίμος see* *Αἴλιος Πρίμος*  
*Πτολεμαῖος* s. of Colluthus **4611** ii 8  
*Πτολεμαῖος* s. of Eulogius **4607** iii 5  
*Πτολεμαῖος 4583* 3  
*Πτολεμῖνος see* *Αυρήλιος Πτολεμῖνος*  
*Πτόλλις* f. of Horus **4588** 11
- Καβιριανός see* *Φλάουῖος Καβιριανός*  
*Καλλούστιος see* *Φλάουῖος Καλλούστιος*  
*Καπρίων* f. of Aur. Hierax **4600** 3, 12  
*Καράμμων 4627* 17  
*Καραπιάς 4585* 12–13  
*Καραπιάς* w. of Antiochus **4607** iii 12  
*Καραπίων* agent of gymnasiarch? **4582** 17  
*Καραπίων* agent of gymnasiarch **4624** 1, 22  
*Καραπίων* f. of Heraclius and Onnophris **4582** 2  
*Καραπίων* f. of Apion **4607** ii 8  
*Καραπίων* s. of Sarapion **4583** 3 **4585** 22–3  
*Καραπίων* f. of Sarapion **4583** 3 **4585** 23  
*Καραπίων 4585* 13 **4629** 16  
*Καραπίων see also* *Αυρήλιος Καραπίων*  
*Καραποδώρα 4607* ii 16  
*Καρμάτης*: Aurelius Ptoleminus alias Sarmates, exegetes,  
 councillor, conveyor of chaff **4597** 3, 5, 9, 14, 19,  
 22, 28  
*Κεβαστός see* Index II; Index XII (b) s.v. *νόμιμα*  
*Κεουηριανός see* *Φλάουῖος Κεουηριανός*  
*Κεουήρος see* Index II s.v. Severus, Severus and Caracalla,  
 Severus Alexander  
*Κεπτίμιος see* Index II s.v. Severus and Caracalla  
*Κεπτίμιος* Ἀπολλώνιος strategus of the Oxyrhynchite  
**4598** 2 **4602** 3 **4606** 2  
*Κερήνος* f. of Aurelius Timagenes **4613** 4  
*Κερήνος* f. of Aur. Diogenes **4594** 2  
*Κερήνος 4607* ii 12 **4612** i 4 **4627** 2  
*Κερήνος see also* *Αυρήλιος Κερήνος*  
*Κεσύρβο* s. of Turbo **4611** ii 9  
*Κίβος 4585* 9, 10
- Κουβατιανός Ἀκύλας praefectus Aegypti 4593* 5  
*Κτέφανος* h. of Aphrodite, f. of Philotera **4589** 5,  
 11–12, 16, 20, 27, 32, 38, 43  
*Κτρατήγιος see* *Φλάουῖος Κτρατήγιος*  
*Κυράδιον* d. of Agathinus **4607** ii 7
- Καιωνώφρις* d. of Petemennophris and Esersois **4586** 1,  
 8, 17, 18, 24, 31, 39–40  
*Καπισόις 4586* 13–14  
*Καύρος see* *Φλάουῖος Καύρος*  
*Καύσις* w. of Agathinus, m. of Aur. Amoïs **4594** 5  
*Κιαιρία see* *Αυρήλιος Κιαιρία*  
*Κιβέριος see* Index II s.v. Tiberius, Claudius  
*Κιμαγένης see* *Αυρήλιος Κιμαγένης*  
*Κιμόθεος officialis(?) 4607* iii 16  
*Κιμόθεος* f. of Josephus(?) **4611** back 2  
*Κίτιος see* Index II s.v. Macrianus and Quietus  
*Κοτοῆς* s. of Peteÿris **4583** 1, 12  
*Κοτοῆς* f. of Horus **4588** 15  
*Κούρβων* f. of Severus **4611** ii 9  
*Κρούφων see* *Αυρήλιος Κρούφων*
- Ἐπερέχιον . . . of Leonides 4607* ii 4
- Φιλάδελφος sitologus 4587* 8  
*Φιλόνηκος* s. of Zoilus **4611** ii 10  
*Φιλόξενα* d. of Heron, w. of Ammonius **4586** 4–5, 7,  
 17, 22, 29, 32, 39  
*Φιλόξενος see* *Φλάουῖος Φιλόξενος*  
*Φιλωτέρα* d. of Stephanus and Aphrodite **4589** 4, 11,  
 16, 20, 26, 32, 37, 43  
*Φλάουῖος Ἀλέξανδρος* notary **4607** ii 2  
*Φλάουῖος Εὐδαίμων officialis 4607* iii 4  
*Φλάουῖος Ζήνων* former *praepositus 4607* iii 11  
*Φλάουῖος Θεόδωρος* *vir clarissimus*, consul **4615** 2  
*Φλάουῖος Κρηκεντίος 4607* iii 6  
*Φλάουῖος Νεβιέττα* *vir clarissimus*, consul **4608** 1  
**4609** 1  
*Φλάουῖος Καβιριανός* *vir clarissimus*, consul **4615** 2  
*Φλάουῖος Καλλούστιος* *vir clarissimus*, consul **4610** [1]  
**4612** i 1  
*Φλάουῖος Κεουηριανός* *ducenarius 4599* 7, 14  
*Φλάουῖος Κτρατήγιος 4614* 1 **4615** 3 **4616** 2  
*Φλάουῖος Καύρος* *vir clarissimus*, consul **4598** 1 **4600** 2  
**4601** 2 **4602** 1 **4603** 1 **4604** 2 **4605** 2 **4606** 1  
*Φλάουῖος Φιλόξενος* *vir clarissimus*, consul **4616** 1  
*Φλάουῖος Φλωρέντιος* *vir clarissimus*, consul **4598** 1  
**4600** 2 **4601** 2 **4602** 1 **4603** 1 **4604** 2 **4605** 2  
**4606** 1

Φλωρέντιος *see* Φλάουιος Φλωρέντιος

Φούλουιος *see* Index II s.v. Macrianus and Quietus

Χαιρήμων **4589** 34

Χρύσανθος eunuch **4623** 1

Ὠριγένης **4607** ii 17

Ὠρίων veteran, f. of Claudius Apelles alias Isidorus  
**4595** 7

Ὠρίων secretary of the 4th pagus **4607** ii 9

Ὠρος *sitologus* **4587** 10

Ὠρος steersman **4612** i 14

Ὠρος f. of Horses **4583** 2, 15

Ὠρος f. of Amoïs **4588** 9, 18

Ὠρος s. of Ptolis **4588** 11

Ὠρος s. of Totoes, priest **4588** 15

Ὠρος s. of Amenneus, f. of Heracles **4588** 1

Ὠρος s. of Heniochus **4588** 5

## VIII. GEOGRAPHICAL

## (a) COUNTRIES, NOMES, TOPARCHIES, CITIES, ETC.

Αἴγυπτος **4593** 5, 7

Ἀλεξανδρ- **4608** 9 **4609** 9

Ἀλεξάνδρεια **4605** 4, 6 **4608** 5 **4609** 5 **4612** i 6  
**4613** 5, 9

Ἀλεξανδρεύς **4592** 1

Ἀλεξανδρέων (μητρόπολις) **4612** i 10

Αὐγουσταμνική [**4604** 4]

Διοκλητιανού πόλις **4612** i 14

Ἐπτανομία **4610** 13

Θηβαΐς **4563** back, **4597** 7, 29–30 **4612** i 14

Λυκοπολίτης **4563** back

Μαῦρος *see* Index X

Μέμφις **4593** 4

Ὀξυρυγίτης (νομός) **4583** 6 **4584** 2 **4598** 2, 4 **4602**  
3 **4606** 2, 17 **4607** i 1 **4608** 2 **4609** 2, 13 **4610** 3, 14

**4612** i 3 **4613** 2, 12 **4615** 8 **4616** 7

Ὀξυρυγιτών (πόλις) **4597** 3–4 **4600** 6 **4604** 5 **4605**  
5 **4606** 5 **4608** 4 **4609** 4 **4610** 6 **4612** i 5 **4613** 5  
**4614** 1 **4615** 5 **4616** 3–4

Ὀξυρύγγων πόλις **4582** 3 **4583** 4 **4584** 4–5 **4585** 2–3  
**4593** 6 **4594** 3 **4596** 2–3

πάγος **4598** 3 (10th) **4599** 9, 16 (10th) **4607** ii 9 (4th)  
**4611** ii 12 (7th) **4612** ii 6 (8th)

Πηλουσιακός **4601** 5

Πηλούσιον **4606** 5

Πηλουσιωτών (πόλις/μητρόπολις) **4598** 7 **4600** 3, 13  
**4601** 5, 6 **4602** 6 **4604** 3 **4605** 3 **4606** 12

τοπαρχία **4582** 6 (μέση) **4587** 5 (κάτω) **4589** 15  
(λιβός), 19 (μέση), 31 (ἀπηλιώτου), 37, 42 (ἄνω) **4590**  
3, 10 (λιβός), 18–19 (ἄνω)

## (b) VILLAGES, ETC.

Ἐντεῖς **4589** 37, 42–3

Ἐναγγελίου (ἐποίκιον) **4623** 1

Κερκεθῦρις **4590** 10, 12

Κευάθις **4611** ii 9

Μονίμου **4615** 7

Νέμερα **4589** 19

Νεσμίμις **4586** 3, 9

Πακέρκη **4589** 31

Παλώσις **4612** ii 6

Πέλα **4589** 5, 15, 16, 20, 22, 25, 27, 33, 38, 44

Πέτνηι **4582** 7

Σεναώ **4589** 11 **4594** 5, 7, 18

Σενεκελεύ **4590** 3, 4

Σεφώ **4611** ii 12

Σκώ **4590** 19, 30 **4595** 12

Ταλαώ **4587** 5

Τόκα **4582** 6

## (c) MISCELLANEOUS

ἀναμφοδάρχων (ἄμφοδον) **4585** 25

Δρόμου Θοσήριδος (ἄμφοδον) **4584** 1, 15–16

Μέγα Όρος **4620** 18

Πεδιέως (κλήρος) **4595** 12

Τεμεγενούθειας (ἄμφοδον) **4585** 6–7

Χαρι .ν( ) (μηχανή) **4591** 3  
 Χβεί (ἔδαφος) **4591** 6, 9, 10

## IX. RELIGION

ἄββας **4619** 3

ἀγαθός **4592** 6 (τύχη ἀγαθή)

ἄγιος **4617** 6–13, 15–16, 18–19 **4618** 1–2, 5, 8–10,  
 13–18, 24–5 **4619** 1–3, 5–6 **4620** 2, 8, 10, 12 **4622** 2,  
 5 **4623** 1

ἄμα **4620** 25, 28

Ἄμμων **4586** 3

Ἄνουπ: St Anup, abbot, chapel of **4619** 3

ἄπα **4620** 22

Βαπτιστής **4617** 8 **4618** 14

Βίκτωρ saint, church of **4617** 13 **4618** 1, 17

Γαβριήλ saint, church of **4617** 16 **4618** 9, 13

ἐκκλησία **4617** 3–5 **4618** 4, 6–7, 11–12, 19–23 **4619** 4  
**4620** 6 **4621** 2 **4623** 1

ἐορτικόν **4617** 1

Εὐαγγελιστής, church of **4618** 3

εὐκτήριον **4619** 1, 3

Εὐφημία saint, church of **4617** 11

Ζαχαρίας saint, church of **4618** 5

Θέκλα saint, church of **4617** 10

Θεόδωρος saint, church of **4618** 15

θεός **4584** 19 **4586** 4 **4615** 11 **4624** 4 **4628** 3; *see also*

Index II s.v. Antoninus Pius

Θοήρικ **4584** 19; *see also* Index VIII (c) s.v. Δρόμου

Ἱερακίων, Ἄπα Ἱ., church or monastery of **4620** 22

ἱερέυς **4586** 3 **4588** 15

ἱεροσκοπός **4584** 18–19

Ἰουλιανή, Ἄμα Ἱ., monastery of **4620** 25

Ἰουλιανός saint, church of **4617** 19

Ἰούστος saint, church of **4617** 7 **4618** 24 **4620** 12

Ἰσις **4584** 19

Ἰωάννης saint, church of **4618** 8; **4619** 6 **4622** 2, 5  
 (chapel of)

Ἰωάννης **4617** 8 **4618** 14 (ὁ ἅγιος Ἱ. Βαπτιστής,  
 church of)

Καιάρειον: Ἄνω Κ. **4620** 16

Κολλοῦθος saint, church of **4618** 10, 16

Λαμάων, monastery of **4617** 14

Λευκάδιος, monastery of **4620** 20

Μαρία, Ἄμα Μ., monastery of **4620** 28

μαρτύριον **4619** 2, 5, 6 **4622** 5

Μαρτύριος, church of **4617** 4 **4618** 11

Μηῆς saint, church of **4617** 9; **4619** 5 (chapel of)

μοναστήριον **4617** 14 **4620** 20, 24, 27

Νίλος saint, church of **4617** 12 **4618** 2

Ποιμενική, church of **4618** 4, 6, 19, 23

ποταμός: ἐκκλησία παρὰ π. **4617** 5 **4618** 12

προσφορά **4620** 2

Πτολεμῖνος, church of **4621** 2

Σαραπεῖον **4593** 4

Σάραπισ **4584** 19

Σερῆνος saint, chapel of **4619** 2 **4620** 10

Στέφανος saint, church of **4617** 6

σύναος **4584** 20 **4586** 4

τύχη **4592** 6 (τύχη ἀγαθή)

Φιλόξενος saint, church of **4617** 18 **4620** 8

Φοιβάμμων saint, church of **4618** 18, 25

Φοιβάμμων, church of **4618** 7, 20, 21, 22 **4620** 6

χμγ **4615** 1



## X. OFFICIAL AND MILITARY TERMS AND TITLES

- ἀγορανόμος **4590** (25)  
 ἀήττητος **4593** 6  
 ἀμφοδογραμματεύς **4593** 9  
 ἀναμόδαρχος *see* Index VIII (c)  
 ἀναπομπός **4597** 5  
 ἀνδρείοτατος *see* Index II  
 ἀνούμερος **4612** i 13  
 ἀνώνα **4600** 4 **4607** i 3  
 ἀπογραφή **4582** 9–10 **4586** 26  
 ἀρετή **4604** 6  
 ἄρχων **4598** 3 **4604** 4  
 Αὔγουστος *see* Index II, III  
 Αὐτοκράτωρ **4592** 7; *see also* Index II
- βασιλικός **4586** 26 **4595** 13  
 βασιλικὸς γραμματεὺς **4583** 6  
 βενεφικιάριος **4606** 16 **4611** ii 7  
 βοηθός **4589** 28, 47 (assistant to sitologi)  
 βουλευτής **4590** 26 **4592** 14 **4597** 3 **4598** 3 **4600** 3, 4, 13, 14 **4601** 4 **4605** 3 **4606** 4 **4608** 4 **4609** 4 **4610** 6 **4612** i 5 **4613** 4, 13
- γενναϊότατος **4592** 7 **4597** 8  
 γραμματεὺς **4593** 15 **4607** ii 9 (of 4th pagus); *see also* βασιλικὸς γ.  
 γραμματεὺς πόλεως **4593** 18, 22  
 γραμματεὺς πρακτῶρων σιτικῶν **4484** 4, 15  
 γυμνασιάρχος **4582** 18 **4590** (11)
- δεσπότης *see* Index II, III  
 δομestikός **4615** 4 **4628** 32  
 δουκηνάριος **4599** 7, 14  
 δοῦξ **4606** 16 **4612** i 14
- ἐμμέλεια **4602** 8 **4607** 8  
 εἰδοξος **4615** 2, 3 **4616** 2, 5; *see also* Index III  
 ἐνδοξότης **4616** 8  
 ἐξηγητής **4597** 3  
 ἐπαρχία **4604** [4]  
 ἑπαρχος **4615** 4  
 ἑπαρχος Αἰγύπτου **4593** 5  
 ἑπαρχος τοῦ ἱεροῦ πραιτωρίου **4610** 2 **4612** i 1  
 ἐπιμελητής **4600** 4 **4606** 5 **4607** i 3 **4608** 5 **4609** 4 **4610** 6 **4611** i 2 **4612** i 5 **4613** 5  
 ἐπινέμησις **4615** 11  
 ἐπίτροπος Ἐπτανομίας **4610** 13  
 ἐπιφανής *see* Index II, III
- ζυγοστάτης **4606** 11
- ἡγεμών **4604** [6]  
 ἡγούμενος **4593** 3, 8
- ἱερός *see* ἑπαρχος τοῦ ἱεροῦ πραιτωρίου  
 ἰνδικτιών *see* Index IV
- καθωσιωμένος **4615** 3  
 Καίσαρ *see* Index II, III  
 κόμης **4615** 3  
 \*κομήτιςσα **4629** 19
- λαμπρός **4597** 3 **4598** 7 **4602** 6 **4604** 3 **4606** 5, 12 **4608** 9 **4609** 9 **4611** (i 6) **4612** i 10 **4615** 5 **4616** 3  
 λαμπρότατος (*clarissimus*) **4598** 1 **4600** 2 **4601** 2 **4602** 2 **4603** 1 **4604** 2, 6 **4605** 2 **4606** 1, 16 **4608** 1 **4609** 1 **4610** 2 **4612** i 1, 14 **4614** 1 **4616** 1  
 λογιστής **4610** 4
- Μαῦροι **4628** 9  
 μεγαλοπρέπεια **4615** 7, 9, 12  
 μεγαλοπρεπής **4615** 3  
 \*μητάτωρ **4628** 10, 24  
 μητρόπολις **4598** 8 **4600** 3 **4601** [5] **4604** 3 **4606** 12 **4612** i 10  
 μητροπολίτης **4584** 9 **4585** 5–6
- νοτάριος **4607** ii 2
- οὔετρανός **4595** 7–8  
 οὔσιακός **4586** 26–7  
 ὀφφικιάλιος **4607** ii 13, iii 4, 16
- πᾶγος *see* Index VIII (a)  
 πανεύφημος **4615** 4  
 πολιτευόμενος **4600** 5 **4601** [7] **4614** 1  
 πραιπόσιτος **4598** 3 **4599** 9, 16 (10th pagus) **4607** i 4, iii 9, 11 **4628** 4–5, 23  
 πραιτώριον *see* ἑπαρχος τοῦ ἱεροῦ πραιτωρίου  
 πρόεδρος **4602** 4 **4603** 4 **4604** 5  
 πρύτανις **4605** 4
- ῥιπάριος **4614** 1
- σιτολόγος **4587** 5, 8, 10 **4589** 11, 15, 19, 22, 25, 31, 36, 42 **4590** 3, 10, 14, 18, 25, 29, 31, 32

στρατηγός **4582** 1 **4583** 5 **4584** 2 **4598** 2 **4602** 3  
**4606** 2 **4607** i 1 **4608** 2 **4609** 2 **4610** 3 **4612** i 3  
**4613** 2  
στρατηλάτης **4616** 2  
στρατιώτης **4592** 8 **4597** 8 **4607** i 7 **4628** 19  
στρατιωτικός **4607** i 3  
συμβούλιον **4593** 21  
τάξις **4606** i 6 **4612** i 13  
τίρων **4604** 9  
τοπάρχης **4588** 1-2, 11

τράπεζα (δημοσία τ.) **4605** 6  
τραπεζίτης **4605** 4  
τριβούνος **4612** i 16

ύπατεία **4611** ii 17 **4612** ii 10; *see also* Index III  
ύπατος **4615** 4 **4616** 3 (ἀπὸ ὑπάτων)  
ὑπερφύης **4615** 4 **4616** 2

φύλαξ **4607** ii 15

χρυσώνης **4604** [4, 12, 14], 16

## XI. PROFESSIONS, TRADES, AND OCCUPATIONS

γερδιακός **4596** 8  
γεωργός **4590** 12 **4615** 6 **4616** 7  
ἰστωνάρχης **4596** 4-5  
κυβερνήτης **4608** 13 **4612** i 14  
μελιουργός **4582** 3 **4583** 4  
ναύτης **4628** 6

οἰκέτης **4616** 4  
οἰνοπράτης **4621** 1  
οἰνοχειριστής **4622** 1  
ὄνηλασία **4593** 18  
ὄνηλάτης **4593** 15, 19

ὑδροπάροχος **4591** 8

φροντιστής **4591** 3

## XII. MEASURES

### (a) WEIGHTS AND MEASURES

ἄρουρα **4594** 7  
ἀρτάβη **4587** 6, 7, 9, 11 **4588** 5-6, 6, 16 **4589** 6, 7, 12,  
16, 20, 22, 23, 28, 33, 34, 38, 39, 44, 46 **4590** 1, 5, 7,  
8, 13, 16, 20, 22, 23, 24, 26, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33 **4591** 3,  
4, 6, 7, 9, 10 **4594** 9 **4597** 18 **4606** 9, 17, 19 **4608** 9,  
14, back 1-3 **4609** back 1, 3-5 **4610** 10, 14 **4611** ii 1,  
6-8, 10, 13, 15, back 1 **4612** i 9, 15, 18, ii 2, 8 **4613** 12  
**4620** 4, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 26, 29, 30

βίκος **4586** 10, 11, 15, 41

γράμμα **4604** 9, 15

διπλοῦν **4621** 3 **4622** 3

λίτρα **4598** 9, 10, 11, 12 **4599** 2, 6, 7, 9, 11, 13, 14, 16  
**4600** 8, 15, 16 **4601** 10, 11 **4604** 7, 8, 9, 13, 15 **4608**  
i 11, back 2, 3, 4<sup>2</sup> 5<sup>2</sup>

ξέστης **4607** i 10, ii 2-14, 16-19, iii 1-2, 3-6, back 1

οὐγκία **4604** 9, 15

χοῖνιξ **4588** 6 **4589** 6, 7, 12, 22, 23, 28, 33, 34, 38, 39,  
45, 46 **4591** 9, 10

### (b) MONEY

δηνάριον **4605** 8  
(δηναρίων μυριάδες) **4617** 3-7, [8], 9, 11, [13], 14, 18-19  
δραχμή **4586** 16, 34, 43 **4596** 19, 24 **4597** 12, 14  
**4624** 6

μνᾶ **4625** 4 **4629** 13

μονάς **4605** 8

μυριάς **4605** 8  
*see also* (δηναρίων μυριάδες)

νόμισμα **4586** 16 (Cεβαστοῦ ν.) **4604** 8, 13 **4605** 7  
(Cεβαστών ν.) **4629** 9, 11

νομισμάτιον **4604** 7, 13

## XIII. TAXES

δημόσια 4594 II

λαογραφία 4585 19, 24-5

## XIV. GENERAL INDEX OF WORDS

ἄββας *see* Index IX

ἄβροχος 4595 21 4606 8 4608 8 4610 9 4612 i 8

ἄβωλος 4594 19

ἀγαθός 4593 7; *see also* Index IXἄγιος *see* Index IX

ἀγοράζω 4624 2

ἀγορανόμος *see* Index X

ἀγωγή 4616 5

ἀγωνία 4627 5

ἀδελφή 4626 14 4627 12

ἀδελφίδους 4584 12

ἀδελφός 4583 i 4584 II, 18 4610 5 4624 9 4625 5  
4627 i, 17

ἄδολος 4594 18 4608 7 4610 9

ἀήτητος *see* Index X

αἰρεῖν 4586 21 4595 16

αἰσίως 4592 9

αἰτία 4606 9 4608 8 4610 9 4612 i 8

αἰώνιος 4598 5 4606 6 4608 6 4609 6 4610 i, 7  
4611 i 3 4612 6 4613 i, 6

ἀκύνδυνος 4594 10 4595 18-19

ἀκόλουθος 4582 8 4598 12 4604 5

ἄκριθος 4594 19 4606 8 4612 i 8

ἄλλα 4625 7 4628 9, 17, 23

ἄλληλος 4596 i, 16 4597 5, 12, 24

ἄλλος 4586 23, 28 4593 7 4601 i 4604 i 4605 i  
4624 10, 14 4628 7

ἄλυπος 4628 11

ἄλος 4594 17-18

ἄμα *see* Index IX

ἄμα 4597 5 4606 20 4610 16 4612 i 17, 19

ἀμελεῖν 4625 7 4626 11

ἀμέμπτως 4597 9

ἀμφοδογραμματεὺς *see* Index Xἄμφοδον 4584 21 4585 20-1; *see also* Index VIII (c)

ἀμφότεροι 4582 2 4585 5 4594 2-3 4597 18

ἄν 4596 24

ἀναβαίνειν 4624 4

ἀναγνώσκειν 4626 3

ἀναγκάζειν 4624 16

ἀναγκαῖος 4596 18

ἀναδιδόναι 4593 8, 10

ἀνακομιδή 4597 7, 10

ἀναλίσκειν 4626 16

ἀναμφόδαρχος *see* Index VIII (c)ἀναπομπός *see* Index X

ἀνατιθέναι 4593 3-4

ἀναχώρησις 4628 33-4

ἀνδρείοτατος *see* Index II s.v. Constantius Augustus and  
Julian Caesar

ἄνευ 4596 21

ἀνήρ 4584 18 4586 5, 26 4607 i 8 4616 5

ἀνούμερος *see* Index Xἀνώνα *see* Index X

ἀντάποχον 4600 II, 16 4604 11

ἀντί 4596 15

ἀντίγραφον 4601 i 4604 i 4605 i

ἀντιλέγειν 4628 12-13

ἄνω 4620 16; *see also* Index VIII (a) s.v. *τοπαρχία*

ἄνωθεν 4624 16

ἄξων 4623 2

ἄπα *see* Index IX

ἄπαιτεῖν 4624 8, 11

ἄπας 4586 20

ἀπελεύθερος 4585 1-2, 34

ἀπέρχεσθαι 4628 18

ἀπέχειν 4586 16, 42 4597 18

ἀπηλιώτης 4586 9, 13 4624 13; *see also* Index VIII (a)  
s.v. *τοπαρχία*ἀπό 4582 3, 5, 14 4583 4, 8 4584 4, 6 4585 2, 11  
4586 3, 6, 9-11, 18, 25, 27 4588 2, 12 4589 4, 5, 10,  
15, 19, 22, 26, 31, 37, 39, 46 4591 5 4592 9 4593 6  
4594 3, 5 4595 10 4596 2, 4, 9 4597 4 4604 8  
4605 7 4606 8, 17 4607 iii 9, 11 4608 7 4609 6, 13  
4610 4, 8, 14 4611 ii 7 4612 i 7, 14, 15 4613 7, 12  
4614 3 4615 4, 9, 11 4616 3, 7 4628 9

ἀπογράφειν 4584 15, 20-1

ἀπογραφή *see* Index X

ἀποδεικνύειν 4593 3(?)

ἀποδιδόναι 4586 33 4594 15 4595 34-5, 49-50  
4596 20-1, 24 4597 19

ἀπόκοιτος 4596 13

ἀποκρίνειν 4593 16

ἀπόκρισις 4629 5

ἀπολαμβάνειν 4595 27 4597 16

ἀπολύειν 4595 8-9

- ἀποπληροῦν **4597** 8–9, 20  
 ἀποσπᾶν **4596** 22  
 ἀποστέλλειν **4604** 7 **4629** 6  
 ἀπότακτος **4594** 8–9 **4595** 17  
 ἀποχή **4598** 13 **4600** 1, 10, 14 **4601** 1, 12 **4602** 5  
     **4604** 1, 11, 12 **4605** 9, 10  
 ἄποχος **4597** 21 **4608** 10 **4609** 10 **4610** 11  
 ἀργύριον **4586** 15 **4596** 19, 24 **4597** 12, 14 **4605** 7  
 ἀρετή *see* Index X  
 ἀριθμός **4606** 13 **4610** 11 **4612** i 10  
 ἄρουρα *see* Index XII (a)  
 ἀρτάβη *see* Index XII (a)  
 ἄρτι **4624** 3  
 ἄρτος **4597** 18  
 ἄρχειν **4592** 10; *see also* Index X  
 ἀρχή **4592** 8 **4621** 4  
 ἀσθένεια **4582** 15  
 ἀσπάζεσθαι **4624** 19 **4626** 11–12, 15 **4627** 11  
 ἀσφάλεια **4600** 10  
 ἄτοπος **4628** 28  
 Αὔγουστος **4609** 6; *see also* Index II, III  
 αὐτόθι **4586** 16  
 Αὐτοκράτωρ **4584** 22; *see also* Index II, X  
 αὐτός (same) **4584** 7, 21 **4585** 11, 21 **4586** 7, 8, 10, 15  
     **4589** 22 **4590** 22, 24, 29, 32 **4591** 4, 10 **4593** 8, 9  
     **4596** 4 **4597** 4, 18 **4599** 2, 11 **4600** 5, 14 **4606** 9  
     **4607** i 7 **4608** 9, 13 **4610** 10 **4611** ii 2 **4612** i 9, ii 2  
     **4614** 3 **4615** 7 **4616** 5  
 αὐτός (he, she, it) **4582** 19 **4585** 16, 17, 22 **4586** 8,  
     19, 21, 23, 24, 24–5, 33, 36, 37, 42, 47 **4588** 9, 19  
     **4593** [12], 19, 22 **4594** 6 **4595** 11 **4596** 13, 19, 21–2,  
     23 **4597** 6 **4598** 13 **4616** 5 **4620** 14 **4624** 5 **4626** 12  
     **4628** 25, 27 **4629** 4, 15  
 ἀφήλιξ **4595** 4 **4596** 6  
 ἀφήμερος **4596** 13  
 ἀφικνεῖσθαι **4592** 5  
 ἀφιστάναι **4586** 28–9  
 ἄχρη **4597** 15  
 ἄχρυν **4597** 5, 6, 10 **4598** 10, 12 **4599** 11 **4601** 10  
  
 βάλλειν **4624** 14  
 Βαπτιστής *see* Index IX  
 βασιλικός *see* Index X  
 βέβαιος **4605** 9  
 βεβαιοῦν **4586** 24, 44 **4594** 14 **4595** 28  
 βενεφικιάριος *see* Index X  
 βίκος *see* Index XII (a)  
 βοηθός **4628** 5–6; *see also* Index X  
 βορράς **4586** 11, 12  
  
 βορρινή **4616** 7  
 βουλευτής *see* Index X  
 βράδος **4627** 8  
 βραδύς **4624** 2  
  
 γάρ **4624** 3, 17 **4626** 8 **4627** 5 **4628** 28  
 γε **4627** 8  
 γείτων **4586** 12  
 γένημα **4587** 2 **4588** 3, 13 **4589** 1, 8, 13, 18, 24, 29, 35,  
     40 **4590** 1, 8, 16 **4606** 8 **4607** i 7 **4608** 7 **4609** 6  
     **4610** 8 **4612** i 7 **4613** 8  
 γενναϊότατος *see* Index X  
 γεουχεῖν **4615** 5 **4616** 3  
 γεουχικός **4616** 9  
 γεούχος **4595** 25, 35 (ῆ)  
 γερδιακός *see* Index XI  
 γεωργία **4586** 26  
 γεωργός *see* Index XI  
 γῆ **4586** 27 **4594** 11 **4595** 23, 49  
 γίνεσθαι **4593** 3 **4595** 21 **4607** i 5, ii 15 **4616** 8; *see*  
     *also* γίνεσθαι  
 γινώσκειν **4626** 4  
 γίνεσθαι **4587** 7, 9, 10 **4588** 6, 16 **4589** 7, 12, 16, 20,  
     23, 28, 34, (39), 46 **4590** 5, 13, 20, 23, 24, 28, 31, 33  
     **4596** 13–14 **4598** 11 **4599** 10, 17 **4600** 8, 16 **4601** 11  
     **4604** 8, 9 **4611** ii 16 **4612** ii 9 **4620** 30 **4622** 3 **4623**  
     2; *see also* γίνεσθαι  
 γλυκύτατος **4629** 2  
 γνήσιος **4626** 8  
 γνώμη **4592** 5  
 γνώσις **4617** 1  
 γόμος **4608** 9 **4610** 10 **4612** i 9  
 γονεύς **4585** 5  
 γράμμα **4586** 37–8, 47–8 **4588** 10, [19] **4608** 10  
     **4609** 10 **4610** 12 **4626** 6; *see also* Index XII (a)  
 γραμματεῖς *see* Index X  
 γραμμάτιον **4597** 21  
 γράφειν **4586** 36–7, 46–7 **4588** 9, [19] **4597** 23 **4624** 17  
     **4626** 5, 6, 7, 10, 12 **4627** 7 **4628** 34 **4629** 15  
 γυμνασίαρχος *see* Index X  
 γυνή **4586** 46 **4607** ii 5, 11, iii 1, 12, 15(?)  
  
 δαπάνημα **4586** 29  
 δέ **4582** 10, 14 **4583** 9 **4586** 14, 22, 24, 28 **4592** 8  
     **4594** 15 **4596** 17, 25 **4597** 8, 13, 18, 20 **4599** 1  
     **4600** 1 **4602** 8 **4607** i 9 **4608** 9 **4610** 10 **4611** ii 1  
     **4612** i 9, 12, ii 1 **4624** 6 **4626** 5, 9 **4627** 9 **4628** 33  
     **4629** 3, 8, 15  
 δεκαέξ **4590** 20

- δεκαπέντε **4594** 9  
 δέκατος **4589** 29  
 δεσπότης **4616** 5; *see also* Index II, III  
 δεύτερος **4593** 17  
 δηλοῦν **4582** 12 **4584** 9 **4585** 16 **4597** 9–10, 16  
**4602** 7  
 δημόσιος **4586** 12–13 **4587** 1 **4588** 3, 13 **4595** 31–2  
**4605** 6 **4606** 9 **4608** 8 **4609** 8 **4610** 9, 11 **4612** 1 9,  
 10; *see also* Index XIII  
 δηνάριον *see* Index XII (b)  
 διά **4582** 19 **4585** 19, 24 **4586** 17 **4587** 5 **4589** 15, 19,  
 25, 31, 36, 42 **4590** 3, 10, 11, 12, 14, 18, 29, 32 **4591** 7  
**4595** 4, 20, 26, 28 **4599** 9, 16 **4600** 4, 9, 13 **4601** 12  
**4604** 10 **4611** ii 10, 13 **4612** ii 6 **4614** 2 **4616** 4  
**4624** 18 **4626** 2 **4628** 5, 33 **4629** 10  
 διάδοσις **4597** 7, 10, 29  
 διάδοχος **4614** 2  
 διακείσθαι **4615** 12  
 διακόσιοι **4598** 11 **4601** 11  
 διακούμεν **4593** 12  
 διαστέλλειν **4588** 2, 12 **4589** 1, 8, 13, 18, 24, 29, 35, 40  
**4590** 1, 8, 16 **4598** 13  
 διατάσσειν **4593** 8  
 διαφέρειν **4628** 8, 19–20,  
 διαφθείρειν **4582** 14  
 διαφορά **4624** 18  
 διαψεύδειν **4598** 14 **4613** 10  
 διδόναι **4621** 2 **4629** 5  
 διέξοδος **4582** 21  
 διέρχεσθαι **4582** 9 **4584** 17 **4585** 14 **4589** 1, 8, 13, 18,  
 35, 40  
 δίκαιος **4592** 11  
 δίκη **4586** 30  
 δίμοιρον **4584** 12  
 διοικεῖν **4586** 20–1  
 διπλοῦν *see* Index XII (a)  
 δις **4597** 23  
 διςχίλοι **4598** 11 **4601** 11  
 δοκός **4624** 12  
 δοκοῦν **4624** 13  
 δομειτικός *see* Index X  
 δουκηνάριος *see* Index X  
 δούλη **4584** 14  
 δούλος **4584** 10  
 δοῦξ *see* Index X  
 δραχμή *see* Index XII (b)  
 δρόμος *see* Index VIII (c)  
 δύνασθαι **4628** 32–3  
 δύο **4588** 6, 16 **4589** 45 **4590** 13 **4593** 8, 9, 16 **4597** 18  
**4625** 4 **4626** 5 **4629** 11, 13  
 δωδεκάδραχμος **4584** 9, 20 **4586** 6, 16, 19, 24  
 εἶν **4586** 21 **4593** 2 **4594** 7 **4595** 15, 20 **4624** 12  
**4626** 8  
 εἰαυτοῦ **4593** 7 **4596** 6  
 ἐβδομήκοντα **4604** 8, 14  
 ἐγγράφειν **4610** 8 **4613** 7  
 ἐγγυητής **4606** 17 **4608** 14 **4609** 14 **4610** 14 **4612** 1 15  
**4613** 12  
 ἐγώ **4582** 17 **4584** 10, 11, 12, 18 **4585** 8 **4591** 2 **4592** 3  
**4593** 9, 10, 12 **4598** 12 **4600** 4, 9, 13 **4602** 5 **4604** 6  
**4605** 9 **4607** 1 5 **4612** 1 13 **4616** 9 **4624** 9, 11, 15, 16  
**4626** 9, 10, 13 **4627** 1, 5, 7, 8, 12, 13, 17 **4628** 1, 6, 8,  
 13, 14–15, 22, 28 **4629** 1, 2, 5, 15; *see also* ἡμεῖς  
 ἔδαφος *see* Index VIII (c)  
 ἔθνος **4593** 3, 8  
 εἶ **4584** 9 **4585** 4 **4624** 2 **4626** 12  
 εἶδέναι **4586** 37, 47 **4588** 10, 19 **4602** 8 **4607** 1 9  
**4626** 10 **4628** 3  
 εἶδοι *see* Index V (b)  
 εἶδος **4586** 27  
 εἶναι **4582** 15 **4583** 9 **4584** 9, <20> **4585** 6, 16, 19,  
 24 **4586** 11 **4592** 11 **4593** 15, 17–18, 19, 22 **4594** 8,  
 11 **4595** 21, 24, 36 **4596** 12–13 **4597** 15, 20, 21, 22  
**4599** 1 **4600** 1 **4602** 8 **4605** 9 **4606** 14 **4607** 1 9  
**4608** 11 **4609** 11 **4610** 12 **4611** ii 1 **4612** 1 11, 12, ii 1  
**4613** 10 **4624** 5 **4626** 5 **4627** 8 **4628** 10, 29, 32  
 εἰρήνη **4607** 1 5  
 εἰς **4582** 12 **4584** 9, 16 **4585** 4, 13 **4586** 20 **4587** 1  
**4588** 3, 13 **4591** 3, 6, 9, 10 **4593** 8, 9, 16, 19 **4595** 9,  
 31 **4596** 18 **4606** 7, 14, 16 **4608** 6, 10, 12 **4609** 10,  
 12 **4610** 8, 11, 12, 13 **4612** 1 7, 10, 11, 13 **4613** 7, 11  
**4616** 9 **4620** 2, 5, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 27  
**4623** 1 **4624** 22 **4627** 4 **4628** 19  
 εἰς **4586** 10 **4588** 6 **4589** 6, 33, 45 **4590** 23 **4595** 13  
**4597** 14, 17 **4608** 16 **4622** 3 **4629** 9  
 εἰςβάλλειν **4628** 18–19  
 ἐκ **4584** 14 **4585** 5 **4586** 11, 17, 30 **4595** 12 **4600** 9  
**4602** 7 **4605** 8 **4615** 7  
 ἕκαστος **4595** 32 **4597** 12, 16  
 ἕκατερος **4597** 23  
 ἑκατόν **4586** 16, 34–5, 43 **4590** 5, 7  
 ἕκγονος **4586** 19  
 ἐκδιδόναι **4596** 5–6 **4598** 12 **4600** 10, 14 **4601** 12  
**4602** 5 **4604** 10 **4605** 8, 10  
 ἐκέει **4597** 7 **4610** 11 **4612** 1 10  
 ἐκκλησία *see* Index IX

- ἔκτακτος **4597** 7  
 ἐκτός **4606** 9 **4608** 8 **4610** 9 **4612** i 8  
 ἐκφόριον **4594** 8  
 ἐλαία **4626** 10  
 ἐλάσσων **4624** 6  
 ἐμβάλλειν **4606** 7 **4608** 6 **4610** 8 **4612** i 7 **4613** 7  
**4627** 5  
 ἐμμέλεια *see* Index X  
 ἐμός **4629** 8  
 ἐμπαίζειν **4624** 15  
 ἐμποιεῖν **4586** 28  
 ἐν **4582** 6, 7 **4586** 8, 9 **4592** [3] **4593** 4, 21 **4596** 16,  
 18 **4604** 3, 7, 13 **4605** 6 **4606** 14 **4608** 10 **4609** 10  
**4610** 12 **4612** i 11 **4615** 5, 12  
 ἐναντίος **4583** 10  
 ἐναπόγραφος **4615** 6  
 ἐνδέημα **4597** 22  
 ἔνδον **4582** [20]  
 ἐνδοξός *see* Index X  
 ἐνδοξότης *see* Index X  
 ἐνεήκοντα **4590** 27  
 ἐνθάδε **4628** 9–10  
 ἐνιστάται **4582** 10 **4587** 2 **4590** 1, 8, 17 **4593** 9–10  
**4594** 6, 17 **4595** 10 **4596** 10–11 **4615** 9  
 ἐννέα **4598** 11 **4601** 10  
 ἐννεακαίδεκατος **4587** 2–3 **4588** 3–4, 13–14  
 ἐνοχή **4616** 6  
 ἐνοχλεῖν **4625** 5–6 **4628** 4, 21–2  
 ἔνοχος **4606** 14 **4608** 11 **4609** 10 **4610** 12 **4612** i 11  
**4613** 10  
 ἐντάττειν **4602** 7 **4607** i 8  
 ἐνταῦθα **4616** 3 **4627** 10–11  
 ἐντεύθεν **4597** 13  
 ἐντίμως **4595** 8  
 ἐντός **4596** 22  
 ἔξ **4590** 5, 7 **4598** 10 **4600** 8, 15  
 ἐξέδρα **4624** 12  
 ἐξεῖναι **4596** 21  
 ἐξηγητής *see* Index X  
 ἐξῆς **4595** 20 **4596** 10 **4598** 13 **4602** 6 **4606** 7  
**4607** i 8 **4610** 8 **4612** i 7 **4613** 7  
 ἐξοδιάζω **4591** 1–2  
 ἐξουσία **4592** 10–11  
 ἐορτικόν *see* Index IX  
 ἐπάγειν **4582** 18  
 ἐπάναγκον **4586** 23–4 **4595** 29  
 ἐπάνω **4594** 20  
 ἐπαρχία *see* Index X  
 ἑπαρχος *see* Index III, X  
 ἐπί **4625** 5  
 ἐπέρχεται **4586** 28  
 ἐπερωτᾶν **4582** 16 **4595** 39, 51 **4597** 24 **4600** 12  
**4601** 13 **4605** 9 **4616** 4  
 ἐπί **4582** 20 **4584** 15, 21 **4585** 6 **4586** 9, 22 **4590** 24  
**4592** 8 **4593** 22, 23 **4594** 17 **4596** 9, 11, 15 **4597** 7,  
 19, 29 **4598** 7 **4599** 2, 11 **4602** 6 **4606** 9, 12 **4608** 9  
**4609** 9 **4610** 10 **4611** ii 2 **4612** i 9, ii 2 **4620** 1  
**4624** 13 **4628** 30  
 ἐπιγράφειν **4586** 36, 45–46  
 ἐπιδιδόναι **4585** 35 **4602** 7, 9 **4607** i 8 **4629** 19  
 ἐπικρίσις **4584** 8 **4585** 4, 15–16  
 ἐπιλάμπειν **4593** 7  
 ἐπιμέλεια **4597** 11  
 ἐπιμελητής *see* Index X  
 ἐπιπέμψις *see* Index X  
 ἐπιπορεύειν **4583** 9  
 ἐπιπορεύεται **4586** 22  
 ἐπίσκεψις **4582** 13  
 ἐπιστολή **4624** 19 **4626** 4  
 ἐπιτελεῖν **4586** 21  
 ἐπίτροπος **4595** 5; *see also* Index X  
 ἐπιφανέστατος *see* Index II, III  
 ἐπιφέρειν **4597** 21 **4600** 11 **4604** 12 **4608** 10 **4609** 10  
**4610** 12 **4612** i 11  
 ἐποίκιον **4591** 5 **4623** 1; *see also* Index VIII (b)  
 ἐπτά **4582** 5, 8 **4590** 27 **4594** 7 **4605** 8  
 ἐπακόσιοι **4608** 16 **4612** i 18  
 ἐρέα **4629** 13  
 ἔρχεται **4628** 17, 27–8, 33  
 ἕτερος **4593** 3, 20 **4597** 5 **4624** 18 **4626** 6  
 ἔτι **4597** 16  
 ἔτος **4587** 3 **4588** 4, 7, 14, 17 **4589** 29 **4592** 13 **4593** 10  
**4594** 17 **4595** 9, 14, 17, 20, 24, 27, 31, 32 **4596** 9  
**4615** 9  
 (ἔτος) **4582** 9, 11 **4583** 10, 18 **4584** 17 **4585** 14, 20, 28  
**4589** 1, 8, 13, 18, 23, 24, 35, 40 **4590** 1, 8, 17 **4591** 1  
**4593** 14 **4594** 6 **4595** 10, 41 **4596** 11 **4597** 25, 26  
 εὐ **4583** 9 **4592** 10  
 Εὐαγγελιστής *see* Index IX  
 εὐδοκεῖν **4597** 19, 28  
 εὐκτήριον *see* Index IX  
 εὐνοια **4592** 3  
 εὐνοῦχος **4623** 1  
 εὐορκεῖν **4583** 9  
 εὐρίσκειν **4582** 13 **4626** 8 **4628** 15–16  
 εὐσεβής *see* Index II  
 εὐτυχής **4598** 8 **4600** 7 **4606** 8 **4609** 7 **4611** i 4  
**4612** i 8 **4613** 8; *see* Index II

- εὔχεσθαι **4625** 9 **4626** 13 **4627** 14 **4628** 35  
 ἔχειν **4582** 6, 21 **4596** 17 **4597** 13, 23 **4600** 10, 16  
     **4602** 8 **4604** 11 **4605** 5 **4607** i 9  
 ἔως **4594** 13 **4595** 26
- ζητεῖν **4628** 14 **4629** 14  
 ζυγοστάτης *see* Index X
- ἦ **4586** 28 **4594** 7 **4606** 14 **4608** 11 **4609** 10 **4610** 12  
     **4612** i 11 **4613** 10 **4627** 6, 7 **4628** 6, 7  
 ἡγεῖσθαι *see* Index X s.v. ἡγούμενος  
 ἡγεμών *see* Index X  
 ἡμεῖς **4582** 4, 12 **4583** 9 **4593** 7, 11 **4601** 12 **4604** 10  
     **4624** 5 **4626** 12 **4627** 14 **4628** 17, 20, 29; *see also* ἐγώ  
 ἡμέρα **4582** 20  
 ἡμῖνος **4586** 11, 15, 41 **4589** 6, 33, 45 **4590** 23, 27, 30  
     **4595** 13–14
- θανμάζω **4627** 3  
 θεῖος **4593** 10 **4598** 4 **4606** 6, 15 **4608** 5, 11 **4609** 11  
     **4610** 7, 12 **4612** i 6, 12 **4613** 6, 10  
 θέλειν **4628** 21  
 θέμα **4589** 15, 19, 26, 31, 37, 39, 46 **4595** 33–4  
 θεός *see* Index IX  
 θησαυρός **4606** 13 **4610** 11 **4611** ii 9 **4612** i 10  
 θυγάτηρ **4595** 2 **4596** 7, 22–3 **4607** ii 6, 7, 17, iii 19
- ἴδιος **4586** 29 **4616** 5  
 ἰδιωτικός **4606** [16] **4608** 12 **4609** 12 **4610** 14  
     **4612** i 13 **4613** 11  
 ἱερεὺς *see* Index IX  
 ἱερός *see* Index III; Index X s.v. ἔπαρχος τοῦ ἱεροῦ  
     πρατωρίου  
 ἱεροσκοπός *see* Index IX  
 ἱκανός **4582** 20  
 ἱματίζειν **4596** 14  
 ἴνα **4602** 8 **4607** i 9 **4624** 15  
 ἰνδικτίων **4610** 8 **4611** [i 5]; *see also* Index IV  
 ἵππος **4597** 8  
 ἴσος **4600** 1 **4602** 5, 7  
 ἰσάναί **4596** 16  
 ἰστωνάρχης *see* Index XI
- καθάπερ **4586** 29–30  
 καθαρός **4586** 25 **4594** 18 **4595** 34 **4606** 8 **4608** 7  
     **4610** 9 **4612** i 1, 17  
 καθήκειν **4595** 37  
 καθιστάναί **4606** 9 **4608** 8 **4609** 7–8 **4610** 9 **4612** i 8  
     **4628** 13–14
- καθώς **4606** 11  
 καθωσιωμένος *see* Index X  
 καλεῖν **4593** 19 **4615** 7 **4616** 9  
 καλός **4625** 11, 15  
 καλῶς **4625** 3  
 κᾶν **4627** 6  
 καρπός **4594** 13 **4595** 26 **4615** 10  
 κατά **4584** 7, 11, 13 **4585** 3 **4586** 21, 23 **4595** 14, 17,  
     24, 26–7, 31 **4597** 6, 12 **4605** 6 **4607** i 8 **4613** 9  
 καταλαμβάνειν **4627** 7  
 καταξιόσιν **4628** 16  
 κατασπᾶν **4624** 17  
 καταφέρειν **4606** 12 **4608** 9 **4609** 8–9 **4610** 10  
     **4612** i 9  
 κατέχειν **4593** 16  
 κάτω *see* Index VIII (a) s.v. τοπαρχία  
 κελεύειν **4584** 7 **4585** 3 **4593** 21 **4604** 5 **4606** 9  
     **4608** 8 **4610** 10 **4612** i 9  
 κενωθεῖα **4606** 10  
 κεράμιον **4597** 17  
 κινδυνεύειν **4582** 15  
 κίνδυνος **4594** 10 **4595** 19  
 κλήρος *see* Index VIII (c)  
 κοινωνός **4606** 20 **4610** 16 **4612** i 17, 19  
 κόμηε *see* Index X  
 \*κομήτις *see* Index X  
 κομίζειν **4594** 14 **4625** 2, 6  
 κοσκινεύειν **4594** 19–20 **4606** 10  
 κρατεῖν **4586** 18  
 κρέας **4598** 9, 11 **4599** 2 **4600** 8, 15 **4607** i 6, 11,  
     back 2  
 κριθή **4608** 5, 7, 14 **4610** 6, 9, 14 **4613** 5, 12, back 1  
 κτήμα **4615** 7, 12  
 κτήεις **4600** 7  
 κυβερνήτης *see* Index XI  
 κυρᾶ **4629** 19  
 κυριεύειν **4586** 19 **4594** 12–13 **4595** 25  
 κύριος (guardian) **4584** 5 **4586** 2, 5, 36, 46  
 κύριος (normative) **4595** 38 **4597** 23 **4600** 11 **4605** 9  
 κύριος (lord, lady) **4582** 16 **4604** 6 **4612** i 13 **4625** 13  
     **4627** 1, 12, 12–13, 17 **4628** 1, 22, 26, 36 **4629** 3, 16,  
     17; *see also* Index II, III  
 κόμη **4582** 6 **4586** 3, 7, 10 **4593** 17  
 κομήτης **4599** 8, 15 **4608** back 3 **4609** back 4  
     **4611** ii 11, back 1 **4612** ii 5
- λαθραίως **4582** 19  
 λαμβάνειν **4629** 12  
 λαμπρός *see* Index X

- λαογραφία *see* Index XIII  
 λέγειν **4582** 7 **4591** 9 **4593** 15, 17, 20  
 λείπειν **4582** 15  
 λειτουργεῖν **4593** 18  
 λειτουργία **4593** 8, 9, 16, 17  
 λημματίζεω **4600** 9 **4601** 11 **4604** 10  
 λίτρα *see* Index XII (a)  
 λίβη **4586** 13 **4624** 13; *see also* Index VIII (a) s.v. τοπ-  
 αρχία  
 λογιστής *see* Index X  
 λόγος **4591** 1 **4600** 9 **4601** 12 **4604** 8, 10 **4605** 7  
**4607** i 5  
 λοιπός **4582** 14 **4583** 4 **4584** 13 **4597** 15, 20 **4624** 7  
 λυπεῖν **4626** 4  
  
 μάθησις **4596** 8  
 μάλιστα **4592** 10 **4628** 31  
 μάμμη **4620** 3  
 μαρθάνειν **4626** 15  
 μαρτύριον *see* Index IX  
 μαῦρος **4629** 7  
 μεγαλοπρέπεια *see* Index X  
 μεγαλοπρεπής *see* Index X  
 μέγας *see* Index VIII (c)  
 μέγιστος **4586** 4; *see also* Index II  
 μεῖς **4582** 10 **4583** 11, 18 **4588** 8, 18 **4594** 16 **4596** 10  
**4597** 12, 14, 15, 16, 20 **4624** 21 **4626** 5  
 μέλι **4629** 9  
 μελίσσειος **4582** 5  
 μελιουργός *see* Index XI  
 μέλλειν **4624** 12–13  
 μέμφεσθαι **4606** 14 **4608** 10 **4609** 10 **4610** 12  
**4612** i 11  
 μέν **4583** 9 **4592** 7 **4596** 5 **4597** 5, 19 **4629** 1  
 μέρος **4582** 13, 22 **4584** 11 **4586** 9, 10, 11–12, 40–1  
**4597** 23 **4606** 10  
 μέσος **4582** 6; *see also* Index VIII (a) s.v. τοπαρχία  
 μετά **4582** 18 **4584** 5 **4586** 2, 5 **4593** 7, 20, 21  
**4596** 20, 23 **4597** 10 **4629** 2  
 μεταβάλλειν **4625** 3–4  
 μεταλαμβάνειν **4586** 19–20, 25  
 μεταλλάσσειν **4585** 7–8  
 μετρεῖν **4587** 1 **4588** 2–3, 12–13 **4590** 1, 8, 16 **4595**  
 29–30  
 μέτρησις **4595** 33 **4606** 9 **4608** 8 **4610** 10 **4612** i 9  
 μέτρον **4594** 20 **4606** 9 **4608** 8 **4609** 8 **4610** 9  
**4612** i 9  
 μέχρι **4583** 8 **4627** 3  
  
 μή **4585** 28 **4586** 22, 37, 47 **4595** 21 **4624** 3, 7, 14,  
 15 **4625** 7  
 μηδέ **4586** 22–3 **4588** 9, 19  
 μηδεῖς **4582** 21 **4586** 23 **4593** 8 **4598** 14 **4606** 14  
**4608** 10 **4609** 10 **4610** 12 **4612** i 11 **4613** 10 **4626** 16  
 μηνιαῖος **4597** 11 **4600** 9 **4601** 12 **4604** 10  
 \*μηγάτωρ *see* Index X  
 μήτηρ **4584** 4 **4585** 10, 12, 21 **4586** 1, 2, 5, 6 **4589** 27,  
 31, 33, 38, 44 **4594** 4 **4596** 2, 3, 7 **4597** 4 **4615** 6  
**4616** 6 **4627** 13 **4629** 2  
 \*μητρούτης **4629** 6  
 μητρόπολις *see* Index X  
 μητροπολίτης *see* Index X  
 μηχανή **4591** 3 **4616** 9  
 μινῆσκειν **4627** 4  
 μισθός **4596** 15  
 μισθοῦν **4594** 1, 12, 15–16, 21–2 **4595** 1, 16, 22–3, 30,  
 36–7, 39–40, 48–9 **4615** 9  
 μίσθωσις **4594** 15 **4595** 28–9, 38  
 μνᾶ *see* Index XII (b)  
 μονάς *see* Index XII (b)  
 μοναστήριον *see* Index IX  
 μοναχός **4597** 23–4  
 μόνος **4594** 5 **4600** 9, 15 **4604** 10 **4612** i 18 **4613** 15  
**4621** 3 **4623** 2  
 μυριάς **4598** 10 **4601** 10 **4607** i 10, 11, back 1, 2; *see*  
*also* Index XII (b)  
  
 ναῦλον **4605** 6  
 ναύτης *see* Index XI  
 νεομηρία *see* Index V (b)  
 νέος **4594** 18 **4606** 8 **4608** 7 **4609** 7 **4610** 9 **4612** i 8  
 νόμισμα *see* Index XII (b)  
 νομισμάτιον *see* Index XII (b)  
 νομός *see* Index VIII (a)  
 νοτάριος *see* Index X  
 νότινος **4617** 3 **4619** 4  
 νότος **4586** 9, 12  
 νῦν **4583** 8 **4586** 18 **4593** 16 **4616** 8 **4626** 5 **4627** 6  
**4628** 13, 21  
 νύξ **4582** 19  
  
 ξενία **4628** 5  
 ξεινοδοχεῖον **4620** 14  
 ξένος **4628** 31  
 ξέετης *see* Index XII (a)  
 ξυλαμᾶν **4595** 15  
  
 ὄγδοήκοντα **4582** 5, 8 **4590** 23 **4598** 10 **4600** 8, 15



- ὄδε **4600** 10 **4605** [8]  
 ὄθεν **4585** 14  
 οἰκέτης *see* Index XI  
 οἰκία **4582** 7, 16 **4628** 20  
 οἰκογενής **4584** 14  
 οἶκος **4629** 3  
 οἶνοπράτης *see* Index XI  
 οἶνος **4597** 17 **4607** i 6, 10, back 1 **4621** 3 **4622** 3  
 οἶνοχειριστής *see* Index XI  
 ὀκτακάσιοι **4606** 9, 19  
 ὀκτώ **4590** [30] **4595** 18  
 ὀλίγος **4627** 4  
 ὀλόγραφος **4605** 9  
 ὀλόκληρος **4602** 7  
 ὄλος **4582** 19 **4596** 15 **4597** 17  
 ὀμνύνει **4583** 6, 12 **4584** 22 **4585** 26, 35 **4598** 4  
     **4606** 6 **4608** 5 **4612** i 6 **4613** 5  
 ὀμοίως **4589** 23 **4599** 8, 11, 15 **4605** 1  
 ὀμολογεῖν **4595** 40, 51–2 **4596** 1, 16–17 **4597** 5, 12,  
     18, 24 **4598** 4 **4600** 12 **4601** 13 **4605** 5, 10 **4606** 5  
     **4608** 5 **4609** 5 **4612** i 6 **4613** 5 **4615** 8  
 ὀμολόγημα **4597** 23  
 ὀμοπάτριος **4584** 17  
 ὀμοῦ **4611** ii 16  
 ὀνηλασία *see* Index XI  
 ὀνηλάτης *see* Index XI  
 ὄνομα **4590** 21  
 ὄξος **4597** 17  
 ὄπου **4626** 7  
 ὄραν **4625** 7 **4629** 6  
 ὄρκος **4583** 12–15 **4585** 36 **4598** 4 **4606** 6, 15 **4608** 5,  
     11 **4609** 11 **4610** 7, 12 **4612** i 6, 12 **4613** 6, 10  
 ὄρμῶν **4615** 7  
 ὄρος **4620** 18  
 ὄς **4582** 5, 8, 18 **4586** 11, 12, 21 **4588** 2, 12 **4593** 7  
     **4595** 15, 21, 38 **4596** 11 **4598** 13 **4600** 9 **4601** 11  
     **4602** 5 **4604** 10 **4606** 17 **4607** i 12 **4608** 14, back 2  
     **4609** 14, back 2 **4610** 14 **4612** i 14, 15 **4613** 12  
     **4626** 5, 10, 16 **4627** 10 **4628** 9  
 ὄσος **4592** 11 **4594** 7  
 ὄσπερ **4596** 20 **4597** 18  
 ὄστις **4600** 11  
 ὄστισοῦν **4586** 27  
 ὄτι **4626** 11  
 οὐ **4596** 12, 21 **4626** 11, 12 **4627** 4 **4628** 16, 20, 32  
     **4629** 5  
 οὐγκία *see* Index XII (a)  
 οὐδέ **4593** 10 **4596** 13, 23 **4628** 21  
 οὐδέεις **4626** 7  
 οὐδέποτε **4628** 3, 12, 30  
 οὐετρανός *see* Index X  
 οὖν **4592** 5 **4593** 10, 19 **4624** 14 **4626** 7 **4628** 21, 26  
     **4629** 6  
 οὐσιακός *see* Index X  
 οὖτος **4582** 17 **4583** 1 **4585** 15 **4586** 22 **4593** 7, 10  
     **4595** 34 **4597** 19 **4601** 12 **4626** 7 **4627** 5  
 οὕτως **4599** 3, 12 **4611** ii 3 **4612** ii 3 **4617** 1  
 ὀφείλειν **4595** 27 **4629** 11–12  
 ὀφφικιάλιος *see* Index X  
 ὀψώνιον **4597** 11  
 παῖγος *see* Index VIII (a)  
 παιδεία **4592** 2  
 παῖς **4596** 11  
 παλαιός **4623** 2  
 πανεύφημος *see* Index X  
 πανταχοῦ **4600** 11 **4604** 12  
 πάνυ **4625** 5  
 παρά **4582** 2 **4584** 3 **4585** 1 **4586** 1, 4, 17, 19, 24,  
     32, 42 **4592** 8 **4593** 6 **4594** 21 **4595** 36 **4596** 17  
     **4597** 14 **4598** 3 **4600** 6, 10 **4601** 9 **4602** 4 **4604** 7,  
     11 **4605** 5 **4607** i 2 **4608** 3 **4609** 3 **4610** 4, 7 **4612** i 4  
     **4613** 3, 7 **4614** 3 **4615** 8 **4617** 5 **4618** 12 **4625** 10  
     **4627** 3 **4628** 25 **4629** 12, 14, 19  
 παραγίνεσθαι **4582** 11 **4585** 14–15  
 παραδέχεσθαι **4595** 22  
 παραδιδόναι **4598** 6–7 **4602** 5 **4610** 11, 17, 18  
     **4613** 9, 15  
 παράδοσις **4597** 15–16, 21 **4607** i 6 **4608** 10 **4609** 10  
     **4610** 11 **4611** i 7 **4612** i 11  
 παρακαλεῖν **4628** 26 **4629** 5–6, 14  
 παραλαμβάνειν **4606** 7, 19 **4608** 6 **4609** 6 **4610** 7, 16  
     **4612** i 7 **4613** 6, 14 **4615** 8 **4629** 9–10  
 παράληψις **4597** 7, 10 **4607** i 6  
 παραμένειν **4592** 5 **4596** 12  
 πάραντα **4582** 14–15  
 παραχωρεῖν **4586** 7–8, 31–2, 39  
 παραχωρητικός **4586** 15, 34, 42–3  
 παρῆναι **4615** 10  
 παρέρχεσθαι **4592** 9  
 παρέχειν **4586** 25 **4592** 11 **4593** 7 **4596** 11 **4623** 1  
 παροίχεσθαι **4626** 7  
 πᾶς **4586** 27 **4594** 10 **4595** 19, 50 **4597** 10–11, 28  
     **4606** 4, 9 **4608** 4, 8 **4609** 4 **4610** 6, 9 **4612** i 5,  
     8 **4613** 4 **4615** 4 **4624** 10, 20 **4626** 9 **4627** 9, 13  
     **4629** 1, 2, 7  
 πατήρ **4585** 17, 22 **4596** 12  
 πατρώος **4592** 11–12

- πεδίον **4615** 12  
 πέμπειν **4626** 8, 9 **4629** 4, 15  
 πέμπτος **4598** 8 **4600** 7  
 πέντε **4593** 4 **4601** 4  
 πεντεκαίδεκατος **4615** 11  
 πενήκοντα **4587** 6–7, 7–8, 9, 11 **4590** 5, 7, 30 **4612** i 18  
**4613** 15  
 περί **4582** 17 **4584** 8 **4585** 3–4 **4586** 21 **4593** 10, 11  
**4594** 7 **4595** 11, 38 **4626** 10 **4627** 9, 10 **4629** 3, 8,  
 10, 13  
 περιφέρειν **4592** 4  
 πηλός **4582** 20  
 πιστεύειν **4625** 6–7  
 πίστις **4597** 11  
 πλατυπήγιος **4605** 6–7  
 πλήρης **4586** 18 **4596** 25 **4600** 9 **4604** 10 **4605** 8  
**4606** 13 **4609** 10 **4610** 11 **4612** i 10  
 πληροῦν **4593** 10 **4597** 13–14  
 πλοῖον **4605** 7 **4606** 8, 16 **4608** 7, 12 **4609** 12 **4610** 8,  
 13 **4612** i 7, 13 **4613** 7, 11 **4629** 3  
 ποιεῖν **4582** 8–9 **4592** 10 **4624** 14 **4625** 3 **4626** 9, 16  
**4627** 6 **4628** 11 **4629** 7, 8  
 πόλις **4584** 7 **4585** 11 **4590** 5, 12, 20, 22, 30 **4592** 12  
**4593** 6, 9, 18, 22 **4596** 4 **4597** 5 **4600** 5, 13, 14  
**4607** i 3(?) **4612** i 16 **4614** 4; *see also* Index VIII (a)  
 πολιτευόμενος *see* Index X  
 πολίτης **4599** 5, 13 **4607** i 13 **4608** back 2 **4609**  
 back 3 **4611** ii 5, 15  
 πολλάκις **4628** 15 **4629** 4  
 πολύς **4627** 15 **4628** 35 **4629** 1, 17  
 πόσος **4593** 20  
 ποταμός *see* Index IX  
 ποταπός **4593** 17  
 πραιπόσιτος *see* Index X  
 πραιτώριον *see* Index X  
 πράξις **4595** 35–6  
 πρίν **4585** 24 **4596** 24  
 πρό **4593** 4 **4626** 5 **4627** 8 **4629** 1  
 πρόεδρος *see* Index X  
 προκείσθαι **4586** 32–3, 35, 40, 44 **4595** 50 **4597** 28  
**4599** 10, 17 **4600** 16 **4604** 10, 13, 14 **4605** 10, 11  
**4606** 17 **4608** 14 **4610** 14, 17, 18 **4611** ii 16, 17  
**4612** i 15, 18, 19, ii 9, 10 **4613** 12, 12–13, 17  
 πρόσ **4582** 12 **4585** 15 **4592** 3, 6 **4593** [12] **4594** 5, 11  
**4595** 25 **4596** 8 **4597** 12, 22, 23 **4600** 10 **4628** 17,  
 28 **4629** 4  
 προσβαίνειν **4584** 8, 16 **4585** 4, 13  
 προσέρχεται **4593** 15  
 προσκείσθαι **4589** 4, 11?, 22?
- προσκυνεῖν **4629** 1, 18  
 προσπορίζειν **4616** 4  
 προσφορά *see* Index IX  
 προτάσσειν **4593** 10  
 προτιθέσθαι **4593** 4  
 προχρεία **4589** 5, 10, 22 **4596** 18  
 πρύτανις *see* Index X  
 πρώτος **4595** 33  
 πυρός **4587** 1, 6, 7, 9, 10 **4588** 5, 6, 15, 16 **4589** 1, 8,  
 13, 18, 24, 29, 35, 40 **4590** 1, 5, 7, 8, 13, 16, 26 **4591** 4  
**4594** 8, 9, 13–14, 17 **4595** 18, 31 **4606** 8  
 πωλεῖν **4624** 3, 7  
 πῶς **4593** 19 **4627** 3
- ῥιπάριος *see* Index X  
 ῥύμη **4586** 13  
 ῥωννύναι **4624** 20 **4625** 8 **4626** 13 **4627** 14 **4628** 34
- καλάριον **4597** 16, 20  
 σεαντοῦ **4627** 3–4  
 σεβάσιμος **4598** 4 **4606** 6 **4608** 5 **4610** 7 **4612** i 6  
**4613** 6  
 Σεβαστός *see* Index II; XII (b) s.v. νόμισμα  
 σημαίνειν **4585** 22  
 σημεῖον **4587** 8, 10 **4589** 17, 21, 23, 28, 34, 47  
**4590** [7], 15, 25, 26, [31]  
 σήμερον **4627** 3  
 σιτάριον **4624** 2  
 σιτολόγος *see* Index X  
 σίτος **4606** 5, 17, 19 **4609** 5, 7 **4611** ii 2 **4612** i 6, 8,  
 15, 17, ii 2  
 σκέπτεσθαι **4593** 21  
 σμῆνος **4582** 4, 8, 13, 13–14, 14, 19, 21  
 σός **4607** i 8 **4624** 19 **4629** 2, 6, 8  
 σπείρειν **4594** 8 **4595** 15  
 σπέρμα **4590** 22 **4591** 1  
 σπορά **4615** 10  
 σπουδή **4626** 16  
 σταθμός **4604** 7(?), 13(?)  
 στέρνων **4592** 4  
 στοά **4593** 4  
 στρατηγός *see* Index X  
 στρατηλάτης *see* Index X  
 στρατιώτης *see* Index X  
 στρατιωτικός *see* Index X  
 κύ **4593** 3 **4600** 6, 10 **4601** 9, 12 **4602** 8 **4604** 7,  
 11 **4605** 6, 8 **4624** 17 **4625** 5, 8 **4626** 6, 9, 13, 16  
**4628** 31, 34 **4629** 6; *see also* ὑμεῖς  
 συγκομιδή **4615** 10

- συγχωρεῖν **4586** 7  
 συμβαίνειν **4582** 22  
 συμβουλεύειν **4628** 27  
 συμβούλιον *see* Index X  
 συμπαραδιδόναι **4606** 20 **4612** i 18, 19  
 συμπαλαμβάνειν **4606** 20 **4608** 15 **4612** i 17, 19  
     **4613** 16  
 συμφωνεῖν **4586** 14 **4597** 11  
 σύν **4582** 19 **4586** 19 **4615** 11 **4624** 3  
 συναλλάσσειν **4597** 6  
 συναριθμεῖν **4589** 5?  
 σύνναος *see* Index IX  
 συνομνύειν **4583** 13–16  
 σύνταξις **4624** 11  
 συνυποδέχεσθαι **4604** 14, 16  
 σφραγίζειν **4626** 3  
 σωτηρία **4627** 9–10
- ταμ( ) **4609** back 5  
 τάξις *see* Index X  
 τάσσειν **4585** 6  
 τάχα **4624** 3  
 ταχύς **4627** 6–7  
 τε **4595** 36 **4597** 16  
 τελευταῖν **4585** 17–18, 23–4  
 τέσσαρες **4589** 7 **4595** 9 **4596** 9 **4604** 7, 13, 15 **4623** 2  
 τεσσαρεσκαίδεκατος **4615** 10  
 τέταρτος **4589** 6, 33, 45 **4595** 14 **4605** 7  
 τετραετής **4596** 20  
 τετρακισχίλιοι **4597** 12, 15  
 τετρακόσιοι **4582** 5 **4596** 19–20, 25  
 τέχνη **4596** 9  
 τιμᾶν **4628** 11, 23–4, 24–5  
 τιμή **4586** 14  
 τιμώτατος **4625** 2  
 τίρων *see* Index X  
 τίς **4627** 8  
 τις **4595** 20 **4626** 5, 8 **4628** 7–8  
 τοῦνυ **4627** 6  
 τόκος **4596** 21 **4624** 8  
 τοπάρχης *see* Index X  
 τοπαρχία **4589** 4; *see also* Index VIII (a)  
 τόπος **4582** 7, 12 **4586** 10, 33, 41 **4587** 5 **4589** 25, 37,  
     43 **4590** 3, 10, 19  
 τράπεζα *see* Index X  
 τραπεζίτης *see* Index X  
 τρεῖς **4589** 20 **4590** 33 **4597** 17  
 τρεῖςκαίδεκαετής **4584** 9, 16 **4585** 4, 13  
 τρέφειν **4596** 14
- τριάκοντα **4590** 13  
 τριακόσιοι **4590** 20, 26–7  
 τριβούνος *see* Index X  
 τρισχίλιοι **4598** 9 **4600** 8, 15 **4612** i 18  
 τρίτος **4584** 14 **4586** 10, 40  
 τρόπος **4586** 21–2, 23  
 τροφή **4620** 5  
 τρόφιμος **4628** 7  
 τυρίον **4626** 2  
 τύχη **4585** 28; *see also* Index IX
- ὑβρίζειν **4628** 29, 30  
 ὑγεία **4629** 16  
 ὑδροπάροχος *see* Index XI  
 υἱός **4582** 4 **4585** 11 **4590** 11 **4595** 7 **4610** 4 **4615** 4,  
     6 **4616** 6 **4628** 1, 26, 32, 36 **4629** 12  
 ὑμεῖς **4592** 6, 8, 9 **4615** 7, 8 (ἡμῶν pap.), 12 **4616** 8  
     **4627** 10, 14 **4629** 16; *see also* κύ
- ὑμέτερος **4600** 7 **4615** 12  
 ὑπάρχειν **4582** 4 **4586** 8 **4594** 6 **4595** 11 **4615** 11  
 ὑπατεία *see* Index III, X  
 ὑπατος *see* Index X  
 ὑπέρ **4586** 14, 23, 37, 47 **4588** 9, 19 **4589** 4 **4597** 9, 17  
     **4600** 7 **4601** 9 **4605** 6  
 ὑπερφυής *see* Index X  
 ὑπό **4582** 17 **4591** 2 **4592** 7 **4593** 8 **4595** 32 **4596** 15  
     **4598** 13 **4604** 5, 7 **4607** i 5 **4625** 6 **4628** 14  
 ὑποβάλλειν **4606** 11  
 ὑποδέχεσθαι **4600** 6 **4601** 8–9 **4604** 6, 12 **4605** 5  
 ὑποκαταστάτης(?) **4614** 2  
 ὑπόστασις **4599** 2, 11 **4607** i 10, 11 **4611** ii 2 **4612** ii 2  
 ὑποτάσσειν **4598** 13 **4606** 7 **4608** 6–7 **4610** 8 **4612** i 7  
     **4613** 7
- φακῆ **4591** 9, 10  
 φακός **4624** 6  
 φάναι **4582** 17  
 φίλη **4626** 16  
 φίλος **4585** 8 **4624** 1  
 φόρος **4595** 17  
 φράσσειν **4582** 20  
 φροντίζειν **4593** 3  
 φροντιστής *see* Index XI  
 φύλαξ *see* Index X
- χαίρειν **4588** 2, 12 **4600** 6 **4604** 5 **4605** 5 **4615** 8  
     **4616** 8 **4624** 1 **4625** 2 **4626** 1 **4627** 2 **4628** 2  
 χεῖρ **4586** 17  
 χειριστικός **4611** ii 16

- χειροτονεῖν **4592** 6  
 χήρα **4620** 5 **4621** 2 **4622** 2  
 χοῖνιξ *see* Index XII (a)  
 χοίρειος **4598** 9  
 χράσθαι **4586** 20  
 χρεία **4596** 19 **4597** 21 **4616** 8 **4623** 1 **4624** 4  
 χρεω[ **4617** 2  
 χρῆζειν **4626** 10 **4627** 11  
 χρόνος **4583** 8 **4586** 20 **4593** 8 **4596** 9, 11, 15, 20, 22,  
 23 **4597** 17 **4627** 15 **4628** 35–6  
 χρυσός **4604** 7, 8, 13, 15
- χρυσώτης *see* Index X  
 χώρα **4597** 6, 9
- ψεύδευ **4585** 28  
 ψιλός **4586** 10, 33, 41
- ὤς **4586** 35, 44 **4595** 37, 50 **4596** 16 **4597** 16 **4598** 13  
**4600** 16 **4602** 6 **4604** 14 **4605** 10 **4610** 17, 18 **4612**  
 1 18, 19 **4613** 17 **4626** 4 **4629** 7  
 ὥστε **4582** (15) **4593** 8 **4594** 8 **4595** 14

## XV. CORRECTIONS TO PUBLISHED TEXTS

- BASP 10 (1973) 5–13 **4582**  
 P. Flor. III 325,2; 2–3; 10 **4614** 1 n.; **4615** 3–4 n., 11–12 n.  
 P. Harr. I 38 **4550**  
 P. Iand. V 71 **4581** 2b, 14 n.  
 P. Lit. Lond. 126 = Pack<sup>2</sup> 291 **4569**  
 P. Lond. V 1762.19 **4618** 12 n.  
 P. Lond. V 1797.9–10 **4615** 8–9 n.  
 P. Mert. II 62.14 **4582** 17–18 n.  
 P. Mich. inv. 4008.1 (ed. *ZPE* 105 (1995) 245–52) **4613** 1 n.  
 P. Oslo III 126 **4593** 7 n.  
 IV **725** 63 **4585** 1 n.  
 VI **877** = Pack<sup>2</sup> 390 **4561**  
 X **1258** 12 **4583** 5 n.  
 XI **1357** 5 **4617** 4 n.  
 XVI **1984** **4616** 2–3 n., 4 n.  
 XXX **2529** **4562**  
 LXIII **4368** date **4607** ii 16 n.  
 P. Oxy. Hels. 11.8–9 (BL VIII 273) **4583** 5 n.  
 P. Palau Rib. inv. 24.2–3 **4615** 10–11 n.  
 PSI VII 791.2 **4617** introd.  
 PSI VIII 953,6 **4620** 18 n.  
 PSI XII 1258,6 **4595** 1–2 n.  
 PSI Congr. XXI 12.v.13 **4590** 12 n.  
 SB I 4284.7 **4593** 6–7 n.  
 SB X 10295 **4592**  
 SB XII 11081 **4595**  
 SB XVIII 13951.6, 8, 11 **4616** 8 n.  
 SB XX 15008.12 **4628** 10 n.